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This document presents the results of a comprehensive self-study of Central Michigan University carried out by the campus community between 2003 and 2005. Significant changes mark CMU’s recent progress, and there is the need for the campus to reflect on those changes. This self-study, prepared for the university’s decadal review by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, provided a golden opportunity for CMU to assess the effects of recent changes and to plan for the future.

One significant change involves our institutional vision. CMU is evolving from an institution with a regional emphasis into one with greater national impact. In examining this change, we pursued the Special Emphasis option in our self-study. Our Special Emphasis topic is handled in Chapter 8 and focuses on “making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence.”

Central Michigan University was last reviewed and accredited by the HLC in 1996. Since 1915, periodic institutional self-reviews have been an integral part of CMU’s accreditation renewal process. The present self-study differs significantly from previous self-reviews in both the content and the extent of campus involvement. In the past, fairly small representative groups worked to document the ways in which CMU met the criteria for accreditation. These groups focused on gathering institutional data descriptive of the state of the university at the time of review. Their reports were largely accounts of those characteristics and the changes that had occurred since the previous review. That was the process then expected by the North Central Association, CMU’s regional accrediting body.

In contrast, the present self-study effort was organized to have wider university involvement in a self-examination that was more evaluative than descriptive. This was partly driven by the new accreditation criteria adopted by the HLC, partly driven by CMU’s own movement toward more open modes of operation, and partly driven by the desire for a campuswide discussion of the theme of the Special Emphasis. The result has provided a comprehensive set of information and analyses that we expect will benefit CMU beyond re-accreditation alone. In fact, some self-study findings have already had beneficial effects, including remedying shortcomings and initiating serious campus discussions concerning desired future directions for the university.

OVERVIEW OF THE 2003–05 SELF-STUDY PROCESS

An eight-member Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee was appointed by Executive Vice President and Provost Thomas Storch in September 2003 to coordinate the university’s re-accreditation process, including the preparation of the self-study.

1 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/committees/steering.htm
Committee members were drawn from different sectors of the university to ensure broad representation of campus perspectives. To maintain efficiency of operation, the committee size was limited to eight members.

### Members of the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Osborn</td>
<td>Chair (Faculty, Physics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Christie</td>
<td>Interim Vice Provost, Academic Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Cook</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Financial Services and Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Hartshorne</td>
<td>(Faculty, Psychology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Holmes</td>
<td>(Faculty, Business Information Systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxine Kent</td>
<td>(Associate Vice President, Human Resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Marron</td>
<td>(Faculty, Journalism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Shapiro</td>
<td>Dean, College of Humanities and Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During organizational meetings held in Fall 2003, the ASSSC established a timeline and developed a subcommittee structure for gathering and evaluating evidence for the self-study. Five subcommittees were created, each charged with responding to one of the five criteria for accreditation. Each subcommittee was chaired by one of the members of the ASSSC and included faculty and staff chosen both for their relevant expertise and to ensure broad representation across the university. Members were instructed to assume an institutional perspective while conducting committee work, contributing their perspectives as representatives of units but within an institutional context.

The five subcommittees were:

- **Subcommittee 1**: Mission and Integrity
- **Subcommittee 2**: Preparing for the Future
- **Subcommittee 3**: Student Learning and Effective Teaching
- **Subcommittee 4**: Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge
- **Subcommittee 5**: Engagement and Service

Beginning in late 2003, the subcommittees met to construct strategies for conducting their part of the self-study. Their work was guided by the Higher Learning Commission’s expectation that accredited institutions critically evaluate alignment between institutional practices and self-identified mission, goals, and vision statements.

During the first half of 2004, subcommittees identified, gathered, processed, and summarized information relevant to the accreditation criteria. In 2004-05, subcommittees moved to evaluating the meaning of that information relative to the university goals and HLC criteria. Their evaluations were based on input from selected groups obtained through

---
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5 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/committees/learning.htm
6 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/committees/discovery.htm
7 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/committees/service.htm
meetings, focus groups, surveys and interviews as well as their own internal analyses. Subcommittees’ conclusions were then summarized in reports that were incorporated into the final self-study report by the steering committee.

The self-study process intentionally included mechanisms for keeping the university community informed of progress and for soliciting input and feedback. A Web page kept self-study activities within public view, and periodic updates were made to various audiences throughout the process. Feedback from the university community was sought through the presentations on the work of the ASSSC to various campus groups, through subcommittee activities, and through the Web page.

**SPECIAL EMPHASIS OF THE 2003–05 SELF-STUDY**

Early in the self-study process it became clear how much the nature of CMU, and indeed higher education, has changed since CMU’s last accreditation review in 1996. This prompted interest in pursuing the customized accreditation review offered by the Higher Learning Commission. As described in the HLC Handbook of Accreditation, a customized review allows an institution to “move beyond the basic mode of self-reflection,” and “pursue planning and evaluation that further enhance the self-study process and contribute to the attainment of its organizational priorities.”

The desired option for the customized review was to put a Special Emphasis on effectively managing transition. More specifically, a priority for CMU is to more fully understand and effectively manage the changes involved as the institution pays more attention to scholarship. CMU’s primary focus continues to be teaching and learning, but expectations for research and scholarship are increasing as CMU seeks to strengthen student learning and to have more national impact. Outwardly, CMU’s aspirations with respect to these transitions are made evident in the university vision statement, recently adopted by the Board of Trustees.

In early Fall 2004 a decision was made to seek authorization for part of the self-study to focus on the issue of “making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence.” An additional subcommittee of eight members was appointed by the provost, with advice from the ASSSC, and charged with discussing, analyzing and reporting on the issues related to this Special Emphasis. Six of the members were faculty. The interim vice provost of academic administration and an associate dean were also asked to serve, along with one faculty member nominated by the Faculty Association, as liaisons to institutional interests deemed critical to the work of the subcommittee.

CMU received preliminary approval from the HLC for a Special Emphasis in our self-study on the requested topic in October 2004.

---

8 [www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/default.htm](http://www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/default.htm)
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Formal agreement between CMU and the HLC occurred in January 2005. Thus, besides chapters that address the standard criteria for accreditation, this report contains one chapter devoted to the exploration of the Special Emphasis topic.

THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

FORMAT

The self-study report is available in both electronic and print formats. Supporting documents that serve as evidence for or substantiation of claims made in the self-study are not included directly in the report, but are available separately in both electronic and print formats.

Electronic Copy. An electronic copy of the report, available on CD and on the Web, provides links to supporting documents. In some instances, a password is required to access the supporting information.

Paper Copy. Paper copies of the self-study are provided for visiting HLC consultant-evaluators and are available to others for review in 312 Warriner Hall, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant. Supporting documents are on file at that location.

ORGANIZATION

The report contains a preface and nine chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of CMU, including its history, organizational structure and accreditation history and relationship with the Higher Learning Commission/North Central Association. Chapter 2 summarizes significant institutional changes in the past decade and CMU’s responses to the concerns expressed in our last review. Chapters 3 through 7 cover the five HLC criteria for accreditation. Each begins with a brief discussion of the criterion as it relates to CMU and its mission, and then discusses for each core component the evidence used in the self-evaluation and how it speaks to CMU’s performance. Each of these chapters concludes with a summary of CMU’s strengths and challenges relative to the criterion topic. Chapter 8 contains a thorough discussion of the topic of Special Emphasis. A summary and analysis of the major findings appears in Chapter 9, which concludes with a look toward the institution’s future.

SELF-STUDY OUTCOMES

Overall, the process has satisfied the institution’s aspirations to engage the campus in a comprehensive self-study that would serve as the basis for considering the current state and future of the university. In responding to the HLC’s expectations for accreditation, along with the

more thorough examination of the area of Special Emphasis, CMU’s self-study has revealed key institutional strengths and weaknesses that both create opportunities and present challenges for improving the institution. The university looks forward to the analysis of consultant-evaluators on the validity of CMU’s self-evaluations relative to the criteria for accreditation. It further is very interested in the comments and advice the consultant-evaluators can provide concerning ways that CMU might proceed as it moves toward becoming an institution with greater emphasis on scholarship and increased national prominence.
OVERVIEW OF CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Central Michigan University\(^1\) is located in Mt. Pleasant, a city of more than 25,000 people, near the center of Michigan’s Lower Peninsula. The university is recognized by the Carnegie Foundation as a doctoral/research-intensive institution and offers a wide range of baccalaureate programs and a more limited array of graduate degrees through the doctorate. Serving almost 28,000 students (approximately 20,000 on-campus and 8,000 off-campus), CMU is the fourth largest university in Michigan and one of the 50 largest four-year public institutions of higher education in the United States. The university’s 480-acre main campus includes 51 major facilities. CMU’s operating budget for the 2004-05 fiscal year was $297 million of which 58% comes from tuition and fees and 27% from state appropriations.

Visitors to the CMU campus often sense a dichotomy: there is a “large school” feel in the variety of academic programs offered, yet the campus atmosphere is more reminiscent of a much smaller school. Like many state universities, CMU began as a small, specialized institution (a normal school) and grew with the increased demand for more programs, services and outreach. Yet, despite its tremendous growth over the last century, CMU continues to have a reputation as a school where students are easily able to engage with faculty and staff who meet their individual needs. It is CMU’s focus on student-centeredness as well as its historical emphasis on excellence in undergraduate teaching that has sustained the institution’s capacity to accommodate student needs in personalized ways throughout its history.

The university’s most recent ten years have seen significant enrollment growth, as shown in Figures 1-1 and 1-2. Of the fifteen public universities in Michigan, CMU has the fourth fastest percentage growth rate.\(^2\) Within the past ten years, on-campus fall enrollments increased from 16,435 in 1995 to 19,792 in 2004 with the greatest growth occurring between 1997 and 2001.\(^3\) The growth reflects a 23% increase in undergraduate enrollment. The number of doctoral students increased significantly, from 83 to 233, during this period. In terms of total graduate enrollment, however, CMU has experienced a slight decline.\(^4\) This may be due to the decreasing number of international students matriculating at U.S. institutions after September 11, 2001.

---

1. www.cmich.edu
2. Based on 1994-2003 IPEDS data (IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System)
4. Total graduate enrollment has shown fluctuation, but little overall growth over the past 30 years. See www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/ThirtyYearGradEnrollmentGraph.pdf
Growth in number of new academic programs has also characterized CMU’s recent past. These include 30 new majors and minors, 12 new master’s programs, and four new doctoral programs (and the revisions of two others) since the last accreditation review ten years ago. CMU’s Mt. Pleasant campus offers through seven colleges 96 different majors, 10 doctoral programs, two specialist’s degrees and 54 master’s programs. These are supported by 1,008 faculty and 1,353 staff.

CMU has offered off-campus study since 1971. Off-campus offerings are administered by a separate unit, ProfEd, which makes available courses and programs at more than 50 sites in the United States, Canada and Mexico as well as some online options. Four undergraduate, seven master’s and one doctoral program are available only through the off-campus unit. Today, off-campus students make up just under a third of the total student population that CMU serves — Fall 2004 off-campus enrollment was 8,144 (1,985 undergraduate and 6,159 graduate). This population includes a significant number of students from underrepresented groups. There were 167 on-campus faculty, 766 contracted faculty, and 192 staff involved in the delivery of off-campus courses and programs in 2003-04.

Figures 1-3 and 1-4 show off-campus enrollment trends over the past ten years. Recent enrollments have shown some decline. CMU began offering doctoral programs for off-campus students Fall 2000, and doctoral students now comprise about 2.5% of the off-campus graduate enrollment.

Accompanying CMU’s overall enrollment and program growth has been another distinct and significant change: CMU’s nature is evolving. This is reflected in the university’s reclassification by the Carnegie Foundation in 2000 from a master’s comprehensive institution to a doctoral/research-intensive university. Although the new classification technically resulted from an increase in the number of doctoral degrees awarded, it symbolizes important transitions at work within the university with respect to its scholarship activity. A wider dimension of research and scholarship now characterizes CMU’s approach to education. This shift has been promoted not only by greater research activity by faculty in recent years but also by the expansion of academic programs that link research and scholarship to both undergraduate and graduate education. A present challenge is to maintain CMU’s tradition of excellence in undergraduate education as the institution expands its research and scholarship

5 22 of these have distinct concentrations and 15 have programs for both prospective teachers and non-teachers. Most majors have a corresponding minor. However, there are 41 minors without an associated major.
6 February 1, 2005
7 www.cel.cmich.edu/schedules/default.html
activity. An examination of this challenge is discussed in Chapter 8, Special Emphasis.

**BRIEF HISTORY**

Central Michigan University began in 1892 as Central Michigan Normal School and Business Institute, a private institution created to fill a regional need for teachers and business professionals. This institute opened with 31 students in an office building located in downtown Mt. Pleasant but soon moved to its own building constructed on the present campus site.

The institution was the second normal school to be established in the state, and teacher preparation became its primary focus given the poor preparation of teachers in rural Michigan at that time. Its two-year programs became infused with courses deemed critical for educators. In 1895, the school was placed under the jurisdiction of the Michigan State Board of Education as Central Michigan Normal School (Act 261, P.A. 1895). This change marked the institution’s transition from a private school to a state-supported one.

Status as a four-year college was achieved in 1918 when the first bachelor’s degree was awarded, and nine years later the institution was renamed Central State Teachers College. The first graduate courses were offered in 1938, and the first master’s program initiated in 1954. There were three more name changes: Central Michigan College of Education in 1941, shortened to Central Michigan College in 1955, and finally, changed to Central Michigan University in 1959. By the time it became a university, the institution had already expanded its course options well beyond those needed to prepare elementary and secondary teachers.

The latter part of the 20th century saw rapid enrollment growth, from approximately 4,500 in 1960 to almost 20,000 on-campus students today. This was accompanied by growth in programs. The Specialist in Education degree marked CMU’s entry into training beyond the master’s degree level in 1963 and the first doctoral degree, the professional Psy.D., was awarded in May 1980. This period of rapid change also led to CMU becoming the first four-year public institution of higher education in the country to have a collective bargaining agent for faculty. The Central Michigan University Faculty Association, an affiliate of the National Education Association, was established in 1969 by a vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The Faculty Association (FA) is now one of six unions on campus.

CMU’s expansion into off-campus learning in 1971 made it one of the first institutions to significantly engage in distance programming. Our off-campus program unit, now known as ProfEd, was first called the Institute for Career and Personal Development and later named the College of Extended Learning. ProfEd provides programs for numerous off-campus undergraduate and graduate students with nontraditional educational needs.
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE

CMU’s organizational structure is shown in Figure 1-5. The university is governed by an eight-member Board of Trustees appointed by the governor with the consent of the Michigan Senate and with authority granted through the state constitution. The board governs the business and affairs of the university and sets university policy. The board is autonomous in its decision-making, although it is bound by the fiscal constraints of the state funding process, state and federal laws, and collective bargaining agreements with six employee groups, including the CMU Faculty Association (CMUFA).

The president is the chief executive officer of the university as well as an ex-officio member of the Board of Trustees. Four vice presidents — executive vice president and provost; vice president for governmental relations and public affairs, vice president of finance and administrative services, and vice president of development and alumni relations — report to the president. They also serve as liaisons to standing committees of the board and, as such, are routinely involved in board business. President Michael Rao came to CMU in July 2000 following the retirement of Leonard Plachta, who had guided the institution as president from 1992 to 2000. Executive Vice President and Provost Thomas Storch was appointed in July 2003, after a one-year interim period following the resignation of Richard Davenport, who accepted a university presidency position. Vice Presidents Michael Leto, Kathleen Wilbur, and George Ross were appointed in 1998, 2002, and 2002, respectively.

---

8 www.cmich.edu/trustees/default.htm
9 www.cmufa.org/
10 www.cmich.edu/president/default.html
CMU classifies employees into twelve groups as summarized in Table 1-1. The table shows the headcounts of occupied positions on February 1 of the year specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Group</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Number of Employees (February 1)</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured &amp; Tenure-Track</td>
<td>CMUFA</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>NABET</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Professionals</td>
<td>UAW</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>POAM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Maintenance</td>
<td>AFSCME</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory-Technical</td>
<td>ST Ass.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Student Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Numbers are nonduplicated headcounts of occupied positions on February 1. In 2004-05, police sergeants moved from PO group to P&A group. GA positions include those for research as well as teaching and administrative.

CMU’s academic structure consists of seven campus-based academic colleges and one unit devoted to off-campus programs, all reporting to the provost:

- College of Business Administration
- College of Communication and Fine Arts
- College of Education and Human Services
- The Herbert H. and Grace A. Dow College of Health Professions
- College of Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences
- College of Science and Technology
- College of Graduate Studies
- ProfEd (formerly College of Extended Learning)

The University Libraries and the Office of the Dean of Students also report through deans to the provost.

CMU has a strong tradition of shared governance. The groups with the largest roles include the university administration, the Academic Senate, and the CMU Faculty Association. The Academic Senate’s purview is quite broad in scope, covering many issues of interest to faculty, both curricular and non-curricular in nature, as outlined in the Academic Senate Constitution. The CMU Faculty Association (CMUFA) is the agent that represents the economic and related interests of CMU’s faculty through collective bargaining. The latest contract expired on June 30, 2005, and a new one to cover the 2005–08 academic years is being negotiated at the time of this writing.

Two documents address the nature of shared governance: CMU’s Shared Governance Matrix and Principles of Shared Governance. As well, individual academic units have written policies and procedures that are referred to as department bylaws, and the CMUFA and CMU Agreement makes these the basis for many departmental decisions, including faculty tenure and promotion.

---

11 [www.cba.cmich.edu/](http://www.cba.cmich.edu/)
12 [www.ccfa.cmich.edu/](http://www.ccfa.cmich.edu/)
13 [www.ehs.cmich.edu/](http://www.ehs.cmich.edu/)
14 [www.chp.cmich.edu/](http://www.chp.cmich.edu/)
15 [www.chsbs.cmich.edu](http://www.chsbs.cmich.edu)
16 [www.cst.cmich.edu/index.htm](http://www.cst.cmich.edu/index.htm)
17 [www.grad.cmich.edu/](http://www.grad.cmich.edu/)
18 [www.cel.cmich.edu/](http://www.cel.cmich.edu/)
19 [academicsenate.cmich.edu/structure/AcademicSenateConstitution.pdf](http://academicsenate.cmich.edu/structure/AcademicSenateConstitution.pdf)
20 [www.cmufa.org/](http://www.cmufa.org/)
22 [www.provost.cmich.edu/docs/expanded-shared-governance.pdf](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/docs/expanded-shared-governance.pdf)
23 [academicsenate.cmich.edu/NonCad/Principles_of_Shared_Governance_revised_4-1-02.doc](http://academicsenate.cmich.edu/NonCad/Principles_of_Shared_Governance_revised_4-1-02.doc)
ACCREDITATION OF CMU

Central Michigan University was first accredited under the name Central State Teachers College in 1915 by the North Central Association (NCA) and, with the exception of 1922-23, has been re-accredited every year since by the NCA or its subsidiary, the Higher Learning Commission. CMU was first accredited for a master’s degree program in 1957 and was granted preliminary accreditation for a specialist’s degree program in 1963. The first accreditation for doctoral programs was granted in 1976. The last comprehensive NCA evaluation took place in 1995-96. Since 1991, CMU’s Statement of Affiliation Status has allowed the university to offer extended degree programs in the U.S. or Canada without specific review of each new location.

A number of CMU’s academic programs are accredited by one or more professional organizations. The university’s teacher education program is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and has held NCATE accreditation since its founding in 1954, making CMU one of the 174 charter members. CMU’s education programs are also approved by the Michigan Department of Education. Undergraduate programs in the College of Business have been accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International) since 1983 and the Master of Business Administration (MBA) since 1989. A complete list of programs that hold national accreditations and the accrediting bodies is available on the Academic Affairs Web site.
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A DECADE OF GROWTH AND TRANSITION

Many changes have taken place at CMU over the past decade. Perhaps the most significant is the university’s transition from a regional focus to a greater national focus. CMU is growing significantly in its student enrollment, in its academic program offerings, and in its level of scholarship. New campus facilities are being built and changes have been made in organizational structure and financial practices as CMU adapts to its new role. Some institutional changes were instituted in response to concerns identified in 1995–96 during the last comprehensive review by the NCA. These changes have significantly impacted the institution and for the most part helped provide the foundation from which CMU’s new role emerged.

OVERVIEW OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

The following is a brief overview of the major changes at CMU in the past ten years. They are listed here to provide background for later sections of this report. The discussions of the results from these changes as well as many other developments are discussed in the appropriate chapters.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

- Academic reorganization: in 1996, the academic division made up of three colleges was reorganized into six smaller colleges
- Budget restructuring: a modified “responsibility center management” (RCM) budget model was adopted in FY 1999
- Updating of the university mission and vision statements and adoption of CMU 2010, an institutional plan for moving toward the vision

NEW AND UPGRADED FACILITIES

- New academic buildings: Music, 1997; Health Professions, 2003; and a significant expansion and renovation of the Charles V. Park Library, 2002
- Improvements in athletic and recreational facilities: Varsity Softball Stadium, Kelly/Shorts Football Stadium expansion and updating, 1997; Indoor Athletic Complex, Lyle Bennett Track and Intramural Sports Complex, 1999; Theunissen Baseball Stadium, 2002, and field hockey facility, 2004
ACADEMIC CHANGES

- A major updating of the institution’s offerings:
  - new academic programs including the First Year Experience course, five new doctoral programs, and CMU’s first degrees in engineering
  - deletion of thirty-one programs
- Significant investment in new information technology to support instruction and other ongoing operations of the institution
- Establishment of new positions to support faculty development and assessment of student learning outcomes
- Restructuring of the off-campus programs unit to provide a greater service focus
- Four years of focused activities designed to promote learning by raising academic standards in undergraduate programs

INCREASED RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

- Significant growth in external funding proposals and awards for research and service
- Increased expectations for faculty to engage in scholarship and grant writing
- Expansion of cooperative initiatives with businesses, including partnership in one of Michigan’s SmartZones

FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

- Enhanced development efforts, including organization of the university’s first capital campaign
- Significant budget challenges stemming from reduced state funding and occasional midyear callbacks

RESPONSES TO CONCERNS OF THE MOST RECENT ACCREDITATION REVIEW: 1995-96

The most recent North Central Association (NCA) evaluation of CMU took place in 1996. The evaluation team recommended continuing accreditation, which was granted in November 1996. The 1996 Self-Study Report, the NCA Site Visit Report, and related documents may be viewed on CMU’s accreditation history Web page.

While continuing accreditation was recommended, the evaluation team identified seven “areas of concern.” Reports on the university’s progress

---

1 medc.michigan.org/smartzones/program/
2 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/accreditation-history.htm
in addressing three of the areas were required by 1999. The areas of concern and the actions taken to address them are as follows:

1. “The extensive off-campus operations of the College of Extended Learning, especially programs offered out of state and out of the country, continue to have a tenuous connection to the Central Michigan University mission statement and an uncertain place in campus faculty priorities and involvement.”

CMU’s mission statement explicitly states the purpose of the off-campus activities. Diligent efforts have been made to more closely tie off-campus programs to the campus. Policies and systems were put in place to assure closer links involving curricular matters and approval of instructors. Extended learning faculty and staff now play a more active role on committees and in other campus activities. With funding from a FIPSE grant, a faculty development program for both on- and off-campus faculty now brings faculty together in the area of instructional improvement. However, as discussed in Chapter 7, Engagement and Service, the recent internal Board of Visitors review found that the role of on-campus faculty in off-campus programs needs strengthening.

Establishing a tighter connection to the campus is no longer the major challenge of CMU’s off-campus operations. Today the off-campus unit faces the broader and probably more difficult challenge of meeting the demands of a much more competitive and dynamic market place for adult learners. To ensure the continued viability of off-campus operations, the nature and purpose of the off-campus unit have recently been thoroughly reviewed and restructured. Renamed ProfEd (for “Professional Educational Services”), the operation has been transformed from an independent academic college into a service unit to help the traditional academic colleges in their offerings for off-campus students. This is a major change for the institution, and the rationale is summarized online. More details on the restructuring and its effects are discussed in Core Component 5A of Chapter 7, Engagement and Service.

2. “Concordance between the mission statement and vision statement drafts is confusing, and there appears to be significant campus concern regarding the top-down nature of the Vision process to date.”

Soon after assuming office in 2000, President Rao initiated a comprehensive study involving the campus community in order to establish both a set of core values and a set of institutional priorities. This led to a broad-based committee developing a revised mission document that included not only a statement of CMU’s mission but also CMU’s core values, the actions through
which the mission would be pursued, and a set of institutional priorities for the first years of the new century.

More recently, the Board of Trustees initiated an updating of the institution's vision statement. At the board's direction, the provost fleshed out a plan to move toward that vision directed by a steering committee consisting of faculty, senior administrators and staff, and student representatives. Based on extensive campus input, the committee recommended five new institutional priorities for 2005–2010, along with the strategies and key performance indicators for achieving them, as well as a small change in the vision statement. These were approved by the board in March 2005.

The mission documents and the process by which they were developed are described in Core Component 1A of Chapter 3, *Mission and Integrity*.

3. “Governance is a concern, despite the presence of policies and governance structures, which are generally appropriate. Search processes and academic reorganization need attention in an atmosphere of collegial campus-wide consultation with the acknowledgement by faculty of the responsibility and authority of the administration to make management decisions.”

This was the first of the three areas of concern identified by the NCA for which an interim progress report was required. An Academic Senate ad hoc committee was formed in spring 1998 to study governance concerns and to report its findings and recommendations. Recommendations by this Committee on Governance led to the development of a shared-governance matrix that outlined the parties involved in various categories of decision-making and their roles in making those decisions. The matrix was expanded in 2004 to include additional kinds of decisions, mostly within the business and finance division.

There are still areas of significant disagreement with respect to shared governance, but issues regarding senior officer searches and academic reorganization are no longer problems. In general, most consider the current administration to be more open and active in seeking input on campus issues from the campus community. There is growing appreciation that it is the responsibility of the administration, in consultation with the appropriate constituencies, to provide direction and leadership to the institution. The nature of the shared governance matrix and its effectiveness in current university decision-making situations are evaluated and discussed in Core Component 1D of Chapter 3, *Mission and Integrity*. 

---

4 [www.provost.cmich.edu/docs/expanded-shared-governance.pdf](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/docs/expanded-shared-governance.pdf)
4. “The institution suffers from the lack of an effective development program.”

University development efforts have changed in two main ways. First, the university development office and fund-raising programs were reconfigured. The position of vice president of development and alumni relations was created in 1998 to provide leadership to the university’s fund-raising efforts. Involvement of the president and college deans in fund raising has significantly increased. Individual colleges added development officers to their staffs and a more individualized focus on targeted groups was implemented. While still modest, gifts to CMU raised by Development and Alumni Relations have steadily increased over the past decade, from $4.7 million in 1998 to approximately $14 million in 2004. The “Campus Campaign,” solicitations targeted at CMU faculty and staff, has been particularly successful, demonstrating support by employees.

A second significant change involved the organization of CMU’s first capital campaign. Known as the “New Vision of Excellence Campaign for Central Michigan University,” this effort set a goal to raise $50 million by the end of 2006. That goal was reached at the end of 2004, although fund-raising continues on behalf of several specific targets that have yet to be reached. Details of development activities and their contributions to the university are documented and discussed in Core Component 2B of Chapter 4, Preparing for the Future.

5. “Assessment implementation is behind schedule, and administrative leadership and support for the effort are lacking.”

This was the second area of concern for which the NCA required an interim progress report. The Academic Senate formed the ad hoc Committee on Assessment Communications in early 1997. Members of the committee included the assessment coordinator, a former assessment coordinator, the chair of the committee responsible for designing the university’s outcomes assessment plan in 1992, an associate dean, and a representative from the provost’s office. The committee concurred with the NCA that a clear need existed to improve the university’s commitment to assessment and it made recommendations for action in two general areas. First, more direction and support from the administration was needed to recognize the importance of assessment and to provide the funding needed to do meaningful assessment (e.g., develop effective activities, provide faculty release time, hire support staff). Second, wider dissemination of assessment results to faculty and students was needed to improve the impact of assessment efforts.

A second committee, the Executive Board ad hoc Committee on Assessment Concerns (formed in early 1999), confirmed these findings and extended the study to address additional NCA concerns. These included questions about off-campus assessment
plans, apparent inconsistencies in implementing assessment on-campus, and lack of integrating assessment into university planning. The committee collected data and conducted interviews; it prepared a formal report of findings that was submitted in June 1999 to the NCA.

As a result of recommendations made by the two committees, substantial changes were made in administrative direction and support for assessment at CMU. Assessment became the focus of two administrative positions and resources were dedicated to this activity. Specifics regarding these and other changes and their impact on academics at CMU are discussed in Core Component 3A of Chapter 5, Student Learning and Effective Teaching.

6. “There is uncertainty over the commitment of institutional leadership to affirmative action, and the progress made to date may be lost if efforts and commitment are not maintained and made visible.”

This is the third area of concern for which the NCA required an interim progress report. The ad hoc Committee on Affirmative Action was formed in March 1998 as a direct response to this concern raised by the NCA. Five committee members represented the president’s division, the provost’s division, the Academic Senate Executive Board, the Affirmative Action Council, and the Multicultural and Diversity Education Council. To respond to NCA concerns, the committee collected and reviewed information from data archives, interviews, surveys, and correspondence. The committee expanded its study beyond affirmative action to include issues of diversity at CMU.

In a report issued April 1999, the committee passed on information that it had collected with conclusions regarding university performance in the areas of affirmative action and diversity. The committee made several recommendations that targeted weak administrative support in this area as well as a lack of sensitivity to diversity issues within the Mt. Pleasant region.

Soon after assuming the presidency in 2000, President Rao renamed this group, calling it the President’s Council on Affirmative Action and Campus Equity. During the 2000-01 academic year, this committee collected statistical data and survey responses from university and Mt. Pleasant-area businesses and organizations. This study resulted in a set of recommendations which were incorporated into a 2001 Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity at CMU. This detailed action plan has strong, proactive goals and clear responsibilities to promote diversity and to recognize diversity as a key factor in achieving university excellence. The plan was widely publicized on its release, and

5 www.diversity.cmich.edu/strategicplan2.htm
President Rao and other senior officers have publicly stated their commitments to achieving a more diverse campus. More recently, CMU 2010 has reaffirmed diversity as one of the priority areas on which the university will focus in 2005–2010. The university’s diversity plan, the actions taken to implement it, and the results to date are discussed in Core Component 1B of Chapter 3, Mission and Integrity.

7. “The institution did not implement the recommended self-study in preparation for the NCA team visit, choosing to rely upon data collected from institutional reviews of programs and other activities. Data from these efforts were not generally included in the self-study report, although they were available on campus. The method chosen did not provide for the identifying of campus issues and concerns, or plans for their resolution, in the self-study report.”

The campus recognized this shortcoming in the last re-accreditation cycle. For the current cycle, the self-study was initiated more than two years before the year of the scheduled site visit. Leadership for the self-study process was broadly based. Funds were budgeted to support the accreditation effort, to allow members of the steering committee to attend HLC annual meetings, and to hire consultants as needed. As described in the preface, the process was designed to ensure that the concerns of all campus constituencies were heard.

**CMU AT PRESENT**

It is clear that CMU is undergoing transition from a state university with regional impact and centered primarily on undergraduate education to a university with significant graduate programs and designs on achieving national recognition in a number of areas. Graduate study, scholarly research, and liaisons in health and business are expanding CMU’s reach beyond its traditional areas of focus. As CMU transitions to a university that complements its traditional student learning focus with greater research and other creative endeavors, it struggles to manage the changes. This self-study, including the examination of the special emphasis topic, provided a golden opportunity for CMU to take stock of where the university has been, its current status and significance, and how to best position itself for the future.

A key tool as CMU moves toward its vision of becoming an institution with greater national prominence is CMU 2010. This comprehensive institutional plan specifies five priorities for 2005–2010 along with strategies for addressing them and key performance indicators for measuring progress. CMU 2010 should guide the institution toward a significantly strengthened university.
CHAPTER 3
CRITERION 1

The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.
Central Michigan University serves Michigan and the larger community as a doctoral/research-intensive public university focused on excellent teaching and student-focused learning. The university is committed to providing a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs and services to prepare its students for varied roles as responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic and diverse society. Its programs encourage intellectual and moral growth, prepare students for meaningful careers and professions, instill the values of lifelong learning, and encourage civic responsibility, public service, and understanding among social groups in a global society.

The university emphasizes an undergraduate program that maintains a balance between general education and specialization. In addition to educational depth in at least one academic discipline or professional field, the university provides educational experiences in the arts, humanities, natural and social sciences, global cultures, and issues of race and diversity. The university offers selected high-quality graduate programs in traditional disciplines and professional fields. Through its off-campus delivery service, ProEd, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult populations.

Central Michigan University encourages research, scholarship, and creative activity and promotes the scholarly pursuit and dissemination of new knowledge, artistic production, and applied research. Through its support of research, the university enhances the learning opportunities of both its undergraduate and graduate students and promotes economic, cultural, and social development.

The university’s sense of community is reflected through governance structures that allow broad-based participation, opportunities for close student-faculty interaction, and a rich education of residential and campus-based co-curricular activities. Through its partnerships and outreach efforts, the university promotes learning outside the traditional classroom and enhances the general welfare of society.

## MISSION

Central Michigan University serves Michigan and the larger community as a doctoral/research-intensive public university focused on excellent teaching and student-focused learning. The university is committed to providing a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs and services to prepare its students for varied roles as responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic and diverse society. Its programs encourage intellectual and moral growth, prepare students for meaningful careers and professions, instill the values of lifelong learning, and encourage civic responsibility, public service, and understanding among social groups in a global society.

The university emphasizes an undergraduate program that maintains a balance between general education and specialization. In addition to educational depth in at least one academic discipline or professional field, the university provides educational experiences in the arts, humanities, natural and social sciences, global cultures, and issues of race and diversity. The university offers selected high-quality graduate programs in traditional disciplines and professional fields. Through its off-campus delivery service, ProEd, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult populations.

Central Michigan University encourages research, scholarship, and creative activity and promotes the scholarly pursuit and dissemination of new knowledge, artistic production, and applied research. Through its support of research, the university enhances the learning opportunities of both its undergraduate and graduate students and promotes economic, cultural, and social development.

The university’s sense of community is reflected through governance structures that allow broad-based participation, opportunities for close student-faculty interaction, and a rich education of residential and campus-based co-curricular activities. Through its partnerships and outreach efforts, the university promotes learning outside the traditional classroom and enhances the general welfare of society.

## CORE VALUES

Learning
- Student-focused learning. Placing the strongest value on learning and teaching
- The scholarship of discovery and creativity. Recognizing that the most basic function of the university is to seek, apply and disseminate knowledge and insights
- Liberal education as the foundation of the undergraduate curriculum. Articulating this commitment in a general education program
- Graduate education as integral to the university experience. Enhancing the learning environment for all community members and providing leadership in the area of scholarship
- Nurturing and encouraging personal growth. Creating an environment that actively and deliberately supports individuals’ effort to realize their potential and achieve their goals

Community
- Diversity and multiculturalism. Embracing multiple voices, perspectives and ideas rather than the dominance of only one idea, person, faction, generation, race, culture or religion
- A sense of community. Encouraging a shared sense of belonging, the harnessing of energies and commitments to common goals, and the valuing of the contributions of all members to the whole
- Respect and civility in the treatment of each other. Creating an atmosphere of mutual free exchange and expression of thoughts and ideas, civil discourse and conscientious actions
- Shared governance. Supporting the principles of communication, consultation and participatory decision-making

Service
- Serving the larger community. Recognizing an obligation to serve the public interest and to merge theory and practice
- Professional responsibility. Taking seriously the impact of performance on each other, on the learning community, and upon society

Quality
- Striving for quality in all that we do. Encouraging excellence in all of our activities

To achieve its mission and realize its values, Central Michigan University is committed to the following actions:

1. Provide a quality, broad undergraduate education to prepare students for a thoughtful life of service to the community and as a base for future academic and professional work and to ensure that CMU students will be knowledgeable and skilled, liberally educated persons.
2. Offer in-depth undergraduate programs in which students can begin to master an academic field and practice a profession.
3. Offer graduate programs in niche areas of faculty strength that meet regional, state, national and international needs.
4. Encourage the practice of values pertaining to professionalism, character and citizenship, including concern for the welfare of humanity, dedication to public service and awareness of the social issues confronting a diverse global society.
5. Advance and disseminate knowledge by stimulating and supporting research and creative activities by students, faculty and staff.
6. Design and develop innovative and effective learning systems to meet contemporary educational needs.
7. Use modern technologies to enhance teaching, learning, research and administrative functions.
8. Provide an environment that allows for broad-based community involvement and participation in democratic civic life.
9. Provide support services and a physical environment that foster student success.
10. Offer co-curricular activities, including Division I athletics, which enhance intellectual, cultural, social, ethical, physical and emotional development.
11. Create and nurture an environment that attracts and retains students, faculty and staff who embody and promote cultural, racial and global diversity.
12. Provide educational experiences and programs to enhance mutual trust, respect, understanding and sense of community with people from all backgrounds and cultures and to ensure an international and global perspective.
13. Provide service for the public good.
14. Attract and manage resources to enable faculty, staff and students to be successful in meeting these goals.

In all of its activities, Central Michigan University encourages the ongoing monitoring of quality and the achievement of excellence.

## VISION

CMU will be a nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, research and creative activity, and public service.
Adopted by the Board of Trustees, 4-22-04
Revision adopted, 3-3-05

Central Michigan University has identified a series of strategic and immediate directions, which will focus the university’s energies between 2005 and 2010.

These institutional priorities are:
- Create an environment that supports teaching and learning as the top priority.
- Provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and global perspectives.
- Enhance the infrastructure for research and creative activity.
- Provide service for the public good.
- Strengthen the institution’s culture of integrity.

Adopted by Board of Trustees, 3-3-05
CRITERION ONE
The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Central Michigan University’s most fundamental purpose as a public institution of higher education is to provide quality education to students who enroll in its programs. A commitment to excellence in educational practices has sustained CMU through a century of growth and change. Although CMU is vastly different today from the small institution of its origin, this constant has shaped every transition in the university’s maturation.

CMU’s current mission statement,1 adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2002, reflects the university’s historical commitments to educational excellence and service as they apply to the university today. This mission statement replaces one that had been adopted in 1994. In addition to the mission statement, the university has twelve core values, a set of goals for achieving the mission and actualizing the core values, a set of institutional priorities with a shorter-term focus, and a vision statement that expresses institutional aspirations.

The various divisions and units within the university have their own mission statements and goals that tie to the university mission, core values, institutional priorities, goals, and vision. These are generally available on their Web sites. A partial list of such statements is provided in Appendix 3-1.2

CORE COMPONENT 1A
The organization’s mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization’s commitments.

Central Michigan University has expended a great deal of effort to construct and update mission documents that accurately reflect its nature, commitments, and intentions. Traditionally focused on undergraduate education, CMU is widening its focus to maintain this undergraduate emphasis, but also to achieve excellence in targeted areas of graduate education and in key areas of research and scholarship. The current mission documents accurately reflect these institutional changes.

EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

CMU has adopted a comprehensive set of mission documents

CMU’s mission documents have five components: mission, core values, goals, institutional priorities and a vision, which together express CMU’s

1 www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm
2 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Appendix3-1.pdf
purpose, values, commitment to action, and vision for the future. These are defined as follows:

**Mission Statement**\(^3\) *The mission statement expresses the university’s main purposes and reason for existence.* It specifies the university’s “commitment to a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs and services to prepare its students for varied roles as responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic and diverse society.” It does this through both on-campus programs of a traditional nature as well as off-campus programs designed specifically for working adults.

**Core Values**\(^4\) *Core values are widely held principles that guide and motivate the institution and its members.* CMU’s twelve core values fall into the general categories of learning, community, service, and quality. Student-focused learning, a foundation of liberal education, and commitments to discovery and creativity, graduate education and personal growth are the foundation. Community values are also important and are expressed as core values related to diversity and multiculturalism, a strong sense of community and shared governance, along with the respect and civility that must lie at the core of any strong community, particularly those sharing governance. The remaining values speak to professional responsibility, public service and an ongoing striving for “excellence in all that we do.”

**Goals**\(^5\) *Goals are statements of action. By carrying out actions described in goal statements, the university expects to accomplish its mission and realize its values.* The goals intentionally are not stated in specific, measurable terms as they are intended to provide ongoing direction to the work of the institution. They touch on almost every aspect of the university and its activities, both internal and external. They end with an important statement: “In all of its activities, Central Michigan University encourages the ongoing monitoring of quality and the achievement of excellence.”

**Institutional Priorities**\(^6\) *Institutional priorities are strategic and immediate directions for the university as it pursues its mission and vision, while adhering to the core values.* The expectation is that programs and other initiatives shown to be directly linked to such directions will receive priority consideration in the allocation of resources through the university planning and budgeting process. It is expected that the priorities will be reviewed and modified periodically. The current set of five priorities covers the years 2005–2010.

**Vision Statement**\(^7\) *The vision statement expresses the university’s aspirations for the future.* The vision is intended to drive the institutional priorities, with each new set of priorities helping the institution move toward its long-term vision.

---

\(^3\) [www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm](http://www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm)

\(^4\) [www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm](http://www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm)

\(^5\) [www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm#goals](http://www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm#goals)

\(^6\) [www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm#priorities](http://www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm#priorities)

\(^7\) [www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm#vision](http://www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm#vision)
These definitions were developed to clarify the purposes of the different components of the mission documents. The multiple components had led to some confusion within the campus community.

CMU regularly evaluates and, when appropriate, revises its mission documents

While there is no formal timetable that prompts review, the university periodically examines its mission documents and updates them when it becomes appropriate to do so. All statements have been recently reviewed. The first four of these — the mission, core values, goals, and institutional priorities — were endorsed by the Academic Senate on April 30, 2002, and adopted as a group by the Board of Trustees on September 12, 2002.\(^8\) This set is sometimes collectively referred to as “the mission statement.” The fifth statement — the university vision — was adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 3, 2005.\(^9\)

Updating the mission statement

The most recent revision of the mission statement involved wide campus input, and entailed extensive changes in both form and content. The development of the new mission statement began when President Michael Rao formed the University Committee for Strategic Planning in November 2000 to identify CMU’s core values and define a process that links these values and institutional priorities to planning and budgeting. The committee outlined a set of core values and institutional priorities in September 2001.\(^10\)

The mission statement was expanded to include two new categories of self-defining statements: core values and institutional priorities. A set of institutional priorities were developed in 2002 to serve for the “first few years of the 21st century.”

The revised mission statement also reflects the changing nature of CMU. Over the past decade the university has increased in doctoral degree focus, and has moved to greater commitments in achieving diversity, engaging in partnerships with external groups, and creating shared governance mechanisms that function effectively. The greater emphasis on doctoral education was externally recognized in 2000 by the Carnegie Foundation in its reclassification of CMU as a doctoral/research-intensive institution. These institutional shifts were incorporated into revised wording within the language of the mission:

- The 2002 mission statement identifies CMU as a “doctoral/research-intensive public university” in contrast to a “comprehensive public university” as described in 1994.
- With respect to diversity, the 2002 mission statement defines the importance of providing educational experience for its

---

\(^8\) [www.cmich.edu/trustees/minutes/m02-0912.pdf](http://www.cmich.edu/trustees/minutes/m02-0912.pdf)

\(^9\) [www.cmich.edu/trustees/minutes/m05-0303.pdf](http://www.cmich.edu/trustees/minutes/m05-0303.pdf), page 17

\(^10\) [www.provost.cmich.edu/rao_memo_for_strategic_planning_report.doc](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/rao_memo_for_strategic_planning_report.doc)
undergraduates in “global cultures and issues of race and diversity,” elements absent from the 1994 mission.

- By 2002, the university had committed itself to having a shared governance structure in place, rather than “striving” to do so as stated in the earlier mission.
- Scholarship in 2002 is “promoted” rather than “encouraged” as it was in 1994.

**Updating the vision statement**

The Board of Trustees adopted the following vision statement in 1998: “Central Michigan University will be the preeminent Mid-American Conference university.” Because this statement used an athletic reference group rather than an academic one, it was never embraced by the faculty, and by 2002 it no longer reflected the direction of CMU, given its new mission, core values, goals, and institutional priorities. A new vision statement that better reflected CMU’s future outlook and aspirations was desired.

The Board of Trustees began work on a new statement in 2003. A task force made up of trustees, deans, staff, faculty, alumni, and students was formed to work on the vision statement. With input from a campus survey, the board developed a new statement and formally adopted it on April 22, 2004. “Central Michigan University will be a nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, applied research, and public service.” While most agreed that this statement was superior to the former one, some questioned the wisdom of setting a goal of achieving national prominence. Others questioned the intent of the term “applied research.” These issues were addressed in March 2005 as part of the process of updating the institutional priorities and developing CMU 2010 (see the following section).

**Updating the institutional priorities and CMU 2010**

Following the adoption of a new vision statement, the president charged the provost with developing a campuswide process for identifying the priorities and strategies for moving toward the vision. Working with a 13-member committee of senior officers, faculty, a staff member and a student assisted by a planning consultant, CMU 2010 was developed through surveys, focus groups, meetings, and presentations that ensured campus input. The plan identified five institutional priorities for 2005–2010 along with strategies for addressing them and key performance indicators for measuring progress. It was presented to the Board of Trustees in March 2005 accompanied by five recommendations, two of which addressed concerns that had been raised about the vision statement (excerpts in italics):

- Modify the vision so that it reads . . . “Central Michigan University will be a nationally prominent university known for integrity,
academic excellence, research and creative activity [applied research], and public service.”

The development of CMU 2010 revealed that there was widespread concern that the term “applied research” was too restrictive and not indicative of the variety of scholarly activities at CMU.

- Communicate that national prominence is not an end in itself, but a reputation based on the type and quality of work that deserves and results in national prominence.

This addressed concerns that CMU might seek national prominence in ways that would be detrimental to the academic mission of the institution.

- Accept [the vision plan’s] new priorities and associated institutional-level strategies and initiatives.
- Accept the use of the new [standardized] terminology and a common annual, planning cycle.
- Request that the administration appoint a strategic planning committee to begin immediate implementation of these recommendations.

The Board of Trustees adopted the plan and these recommendations on March 3, 2005. The institutional priorities and some of the key performance indicators that were approved by the Board as part of that plan appear in Table 3-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Teaching and Learning as the Top Priority | • Student-to-faculty ratio on-campus and class size  
• NSSE Benchmarks: Academic challenge and enriching educational experiences  
• Student performance on tests of general education knowledge and skills  
• Retention and diversity of students, faculty and staff  
• Percentage of first-choice candidates hired |
| II. Education that Enhances Diversity and Global Perspectives | • Number of graduates of global/diversity academic programs  
• Enrollments in global/diversity courses |
| III. Research and Creative Activity | • Number of publications and performances in national & international peer-reviewed venues  
• Number of successful national award and grant competitions  
• Total grant and contract funding  
• Number of students conducting, publishing and presenting scholarly works |
| IV. Service for the Public Good | • Number of new programs and enrollments in Prof Ed  
• Number of offices held in national and community organizations  
• Number of student volunteers |
| V. Integrity | • Per student state funding  
• Total alumni giving  
• Percent of budget directed to institutional priorities |

Note: This is an abbreviated list. See CMU 2010 for complete list of KPIs.
CMU's mission documents state a strong commitment to high academic standards

A commitment to educational excellence has been a guiding principle that has pervaded CMU’s mission since the institution’s founding. The mission statement emphasizes “excellent teaching and student-focused learning” and there is the commitment to high standards expressed in the core values of “striving for quality in all that we do” and “encouraging excellence in all of our activities.”

Most recently, the commitment to quality academic programs has been reaffirmed through CMU 2010. The first institutional priority for 2005–2010 is to “create an environment that supports teaching and learning as the top priority.” The specific actions that are planned are to

- Raise academic standards by increasing expectations and learning across the curriculum
- Provide students opportunities to synthesize, integrate and apply their knowledge
- Improve the general education program
- Expand programs that promote student engagement and academic success
- Target, attract and retain well-qualified students, faculty and staff
- Decrease the current student-to-faculty ratio

CMU’s mission documents state goals for the learning to be achieved by its students

The mission statement calls for an undergraduate program that offers depth in at least one academic discipline or professional field, and a broad foundation “in the arts, humanities, natural and social sciences, global cultures, and issues of race and diversity.” Through its core values, CMU states its commitments to student-focused learning, to the scholarship of discovery and creativity, to liberal education as the foundation for the curriculum, to graduate education as integral to enhancing the learning environment, and to creating an environment conducive to personal growth. The mission statement further specifies that CMU’s programs “encourage intellectual and moral growth, prepare students for meaningful careers and professions, instill the values of lifelong learning, and encourage civic responsibility, public service and understanding among social groups in a global society.”

The mission statement clearly states that CMU has expanded what it considers to be a quality educational program to include research and outreach components:

- “Through its support of research, the university enhances the learning opportunities of both its undergraduate and graduate students...”
- “Through its partnerships and outreach efforts, the university promotes learning outside of the traditional classroom...”
CMU’s core values and goal statements show that CMU is committed to its graduates receiving a liberal education, learning the importance of social responsibility, accepting the value of diversity, and developing a global perspective. These learning goals are addressed through the general education program.

*CMU 2010* outlines a number of initiatives currently underway that are designed to support the learning goals. A few are to:

- Provide students opportunities to synthesize, integrate and apply their knowledge,
- Improve the quality and rigor of the general education program,
- Develop and better integrate international programs into the curriculum and campus life,
- Enhance programs that foster better understanding across diverse groups,
- Increase the number of undergraduates engaged in research and creative activity,
- Recognize and promote students’ public service efforts.

The constituencies that CMU intends to serve are identified in the mission documents

In its mission statement, CMU defines its constituents as “Michigan and the larger community.” The most important components of this broad constituency are CMU’s students, faculty and staff and an array of external groups.

Students

Students include undergraduate as well as graduate learners. Students may be involved in on-campus or off-campus classes and programs. Mission statements specify the preparation that CMU intends to provide these students, including the intent “to prepare its students for varied roles as responsible citizens and leaders in a diverse and democratic society,” and the intent to “prepare students for meaningful careers and professions, instill the values of lifelong learning, and encourage civic responsibility.” Adult learners are specifically mentioned in a statement that reflects CMU’s long-standing commitment to provide higher education access to individuals who may otherwise have difficulty obtaining such access: “Through its off-campus delivery service, ProfEd, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult populations.”
Faculty and staff

It is through the day-to-day activities and practices of faculty and staff that CMU is able to put its mission into action. These actions are stated in general terms in the goal statements of the mission documents. The goals include the commitment to support faculty and staff in their work.

Goal 14: Attract and manage resources to enable faculty, staff, and students to be successful in meeting [CMU’s] goals.

External constituencies

CMU has a long history of engagement with the surrounding community and beyond. The opening sentence of the mission statement refers to “Michigan and the larger community” as CMU’s overall service focus. In its core values relating to service, CMU defines the larger community, the learning community, and society as recipients of its work:

Core value: Serving the larger community. Recognizing an obligation to serve the public interest and to merge theory and practice.

Core value: Professional responsibility. Taking seriously the impact of performance on each other, on the learning community, and upon society.

In terms of its external constituencies, the university serves its immediate Mt. Pleasant community, the surrounding central Michigan region, the state of Michigan, as well as national and international constituents. These groups are spoken of within mission statements concerning “public service,” “general welfare of society,” “economic, cultural, and social development,” “serving the larger community,” and “broad-based community involvement.”

CMU’s mission statements are publicly and widely distributed

CMU’s mission statements are readily available both to the campus community and to the general public, including prospective students. They appear on the university Web site and are prominently published in the three versions of the university bulletin: the Undergraduate Studies Bulletin, the College of Graduate Studies Bulletin, and Off-Campus Programs Bulletin. Copies are posted in most university offices that receive public visitors. Links to the mission statements also appear on university Web sites such as that of the Office of the Provost and the Council of Chairs.

14 www.cmich.edu
15 bulletins.cmich.edu/2004/ug/default.asp
16 bulletins.cmich.edu/2004/gr/default.asp
17 bulletins.cmich.edu/2004/cel/default.asp
18 www.provost.cmich.edu/
19 chairs.cmich.edu/
EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 1A

CMU has a comprehensive set of mission documents that define CMU’s purpose, direction for the future and its institutional priorities. These are current and were developed with wide campus input. They clearly articulate CMU’s commitment to excellence in teaching and learning, to the scholarship of discovery and creativity, to liberal education as the foundation for the undergraduate curriculum, and to the value of diversity and global awareness in learning environments. The mission documents state goals for learning to be achieved by CMU students and define the constituencies CMU intends to serve. CMU is taking action to carry out its stated mission.

Some campus members have concerns about whether CMU should seek to gain national prominence as expressed in the vision statement, and the ways by which it may seek to do so. Not everyone at CMU fully understands the purposes of the multiple components of the mission documents.

CORE COMPONENT 1B

In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

Central Michigan University has come to recognize the strengths afforded to a university when diversity is a defining characteristic of its learning environments. CMU has therefore been proactive in incorporating language into its mission documents that recognizes diverse perspectives as an essential part of higher education.

EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

CMU’s mission documents strongly reflect a commitment to educating students to live and work in a multicultural world

CMU’s recognition of diversity and its importance in the modern world have been incorporated into its mission documents. In its mission statement, CMU commits to preparing its students “for varied roles as responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic and diverse society” and to providing “educational experiences in . . . global cultures, and issues of race and diversity.”

Among the core values on community, CMU’s commitment to diversity is made explicit:

*Core Value: Diversity and multiculturalism, embracing multiple voices, perspectives and ideas rather than the dominance of only one idea, person, faction, generation, race, culture or religion.*

Two university goals underscore CMU’s commitment to diversity:
Goal 11: Create and nurture an environment that attracts and retains students, faculty and staff who embody and promote cultural, racial and global diversity.

Goal 12: Provide educational experiences and programs to enhance mutual trust, respect, understanding and sense of community with people from all backgrounds and cultures and to ensure an international and global perspective.

Both the former and current institutional priorities speak to promoting and enhancing diversity.

The pervasiveness of this theme in the mission documents shows clearly the institution’s recognition of the importance of preparing students to live in a diverse world.

**CMU recognizes inherent challenges and opportunities related to diversity**

CMU must take into account two fundamental factors when considering diversity issues. First, CMU has been historically homogeneous in its on-campus student population, and it is located in a community that is similarly homogeneous. Second, CMU is located near the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Reservation and enjoys a special relationship with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe.

As of Fall 2004, about 90% of CMU’s on-campus student body was white, and over 90% of CMU’s undergraduates come from Michigan. Minority student on-campus enrollment was 8.2% (1627), with an additional 1.9% (375) international students; just over 2% of on-campus students are registered with Student Disability Services. At the same time, Isabella County, in which CMU is located, has an ethnic/minority population of less than 10% (2000 Census), and this includes those Native Americans residing on the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Reservation. The limited diversity within student, staff, faculty, and community populations has made attracting minority students and employees to CMU a challenge, limiting CMU’s ability to create an environment where students benefit from a healthy mix of ideas and perspectives.

CMU’s proximity to the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Reservation coupled with the fact that the university uses the nickname “Chippewas” for its athletic teams produces a special importance to the university’s relationship with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, CMU values this relationship and takes measures to ensure that respect, collegiality, and mutual trust characterize university-tribal relations. CMU and the Tribe have signed joint proclamations regarding the relationship. Efforts are made to collaborate in ways that improve this relationship through the mutual sharing of resources and the promotion of mutual interests.

---

21 www.diversity.cmich.edu/nativ/CMU=TribeResolution.pdf
CMU has an official plan to enhance diversity

The Reverend Al Sharpton said, during CMU’s 2005 Martin Luther King Week activities, “If you only know how to relate to people just like you, you are not really roundly educated and not prepared for the world.” To act on its commitment to preparing its students well, CMU adopted a Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity in February 2001.

The plan begins with CMU’s definition of diversity:

“For the purpose of this strategic plan, diversity is defined as:
1. the range of differences among people, especially in the characteristics covered by CMU’s Affirmative Action Protocol,
2. an attitude that recognizes the value and contributions of all members of our community, and
3. a commitment to respect and provide equitable treatment for members of our community, especially those from underrepresented groups.”

It then lists six broad goals aligned with the university’s mission:

Goal 1: Create a community that values diversity.

Goal 2: Recruit and support the administration and organizational structure needed to coordinate and monitor campus climate.

Goal 3: Recruit, hire, retain and promote faculty and staff who will enhance diversity across all levels and areas of the university.

Goal 4: Recruit and retain students from a diversity of backgrounds, especially those from underrepresented groups.

Goal 5: Provide professional development activities that assist all personnel in the understanding of their own and other cultures.

Goal 6: Infuse diversity into the curriculum and promote pedagogical strategies that encourage student involvement and facilitate respect of diverse perspectives.

What has been achieved through the diversity plan is summarized below (see Table 3-5).

CMU has undertaken initiatives to promote diversity

CMU has taken a number of actions in support of addressing the goals of the diversity plan. Examples in four distinctly different areas are as follows.
Organizational structure

CMU has created a number of positions and units designed to address diversity issues and provide programming that heightens awareness of diversity and helps incorporate it into campus life. The administrative structure includes an assistant vice president for diversity and international education and her office; the offices of International Education, Minority Student Services, Native American Programs, Gay and Lesbian Programs, Student Disability Services, and Women’s Studies; and the Multicultural Education Center. Residence halls are staffed with multicultural advisors. Despite this support, concerns have been expressed about the turnover rate in some of these positions.

Recruiting efforts

The admissions office actively seeks to increase the number of students from underrepresented groups. Admissions representatives frequently visit areas throughout the state where they encourage minority students to consider applying to CMU. There are scholarships specifically aimed at attracting such students.23 The past five years have seen modest progress in increasing the percentage of minority students on campus, as shown in Table 3-2. On-campus minority student enrollment increased from 7.2% in Fall 2000 to 8.2% in Fall 2004. For comparison, the numbers were 5.9% in 1993 and 7.0% in 1998.

CMU’s off-campus programs have traditionally enrolled much larger percentages of minorities, as shown in the table. Most of the off-campus enrollment consists of graduate students, and CMU is one of the largest granter of minority graduate degrees in the country.

Because over 90% of CMU undergraduates come from Michigan, the university has attempted to increase the numbers of students from other geographic regions, including international locations. CMU’s record in this area is shown in Table 3-3. There has been little change for undergraduate students. For graduate students, the number of U.S. students from states other than Michigan has increased slightly, while the international student numbers have decreased, likely as a result of repercussions from the events of 9/11.

Efforts are also made to increase the diversity of the faculty and staff. All academic colleges and most departments are required to have a five-year strategic plan for increasing diversity in their unit. The Office of Human Resources, Affirmative Action and Faculty Personnel Services oversee recruitment and hiring to assure that affirmative action and equal opportunity searches are conducted. Table 3-4 shows that there has been a positive trend in the numbers of minority faculty and staff over the past five years, although the percentages remain modest.

[23 financialaid.cmich.edu/cm_u_scholarships.htm]
Table 3-2. Five-Year History of Minority Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On-Campus Students</th>
<th>Off-Campus Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Students (graduate and undergraduate)</td>
<td>Minority Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>18,471</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>19,188</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>19,380</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19,402</td>
<td>1,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19,792</td>
<td>1,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3. Five-Year History of Out-of-State and International Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On-Campus Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>On-Campus Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Undergrad. Students</td>
<td>Out-of-State Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16,374</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>17,162</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>17,453</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17,509</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17,949</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4. Five-Year History of Minority Faculty and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff and Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Staff</td>
<td>Minority Staff</td>
<td>% of Total Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the CMU on-campus population reveals two groups that significantly contribute to the diversity: graduate students and students involved in intercollegiate athletics. About 21% of CMU’s graduate students are not from Michigan — 9% are from other states, and 14% are from other countries. Athletics actively recruits minority and out-of-state student-athletes; minorities represent about 20% of the student-athlete population at CMU.
Outreach to communities and regions external to the Mt. Pleasant campus

CMU uses outreach activities in regions with population characteristics that differ from that of the Mt. Pleasant campus to enhance diversity and maintain connections to minority communities. Two such efforts, both of which also help with recruiting minorities to become CMU students, are described in detail as an illustration:

GEAR UP24 (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs) targets low-income middle school and high school students who need assistance preparing for college. Since 1999, CMU has partnered with several Flint public schools and several community groups to provide a GEAR UP program. Through the program, students gain academic skills, information and encouragement to help them graduate from high school and go on to college prepared to succeed. GEAR UP sponsors college visits and summer workshops on the CMU campus to give students the opportunity to experience university life. Parent Resource Centers offer career planning, parenting workshops, college preparation, financial aid information, and educational activities for the entire family. Teachers can take advantage of professional development and specialized training, including summer enrichment workshops at CMU. The GEAR UP program was initiated in 1999 with a six-year federal grant and subsequently supplemented with a second six-year state grant beginning in 2001. GEAR UP will be institutionalized into each participating school by the end of the funding cycle.

The CMU Detroit Outreach office is responsible for bringing Central Michigan University to the metropolitan Detroit area. The university serves more than 4,000 students at locations in this region. This office initiates and develops partnerships with Detroit-area corporations and relationships with Detroit’s elected officials, assists with fundraising for scholarships and academic programs, and keeps the university informed on matters that relate to community, corporate and government relations in metropolitan Detroit. Specific examples of this office’s activities include:

- administration of the Lem Tucker Scholarship for minority students who major in journalism;
- assisting the CMU African American Alumni Association Chapter’s activities;
- arranging alumni events in the Metro Detroit area;
- initiating exploratory meetings with corporations in Metro Detroit area to discuss partnerships;

24 diversity.cmich.edu/gearup/
collaborating with Detroit public schools, the Detroit Urban League, and the NAACP on recruitment efforts for incoming freshmen;

• working with corporations and minority-owned businesses in Metro Detroit to develop summer employment opportunities for CMU students;

• supporting campus initiatives such as Focus Hope;

• inviting legislators from the Detroit area to CMU events.

Diversity-focused education and training

One of the goals of the Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity is “to provide professional development activities that assist all personnel in their understanding of their own and other cultures.” CMU implements a wide variety of educational programming and workshops directed at this goal. Two examples are:

• The Office of Residence Life and Auxiliary Services provides diversity-related educational programming for residence hall students and staff. This office also encourages its staff to be involved in diversity-related initiatives by other units.

• Staff and faculty have opportunities to participate in educational and training programs focusing on diversity issues. These include workshops for new employees, the “Winning Balance” and “Prejudice Reduction” workshops, “Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity” seminars, and the programs offered by the Multicultural Education Center.

On a more formal level, CMU’s general education program has requirements designed to create global awareness and foster multicultural understanding. Each undergraduate student must take three credit hours in each of the following: global cultures, racism and cultural diversity in the United States, and integrative or multidisciplinary studies. This is addressed more fully as part of Core Component 2A in Chapter 6, Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge.

CMU assesses its progress toward its diversity goals

The Office of Institutional Diversity monitors progress on achieving the Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity goals with evaluative feedback from the Diversity Campus Climate Committee and the Multicultural and Diversity Education Council25 (MDEC) of the Academic Senate. Although there has been a good deal of progress toward achieving the plan’s goals and objectives, there are still concerns about the state of diversity at CMU, especially by students from underrepresented groups. Table 3-5 summarizes an assessment of where we are, based mainly on the 2004 Diversity Report Card issued by the Diversity Campus Climate
### Table 3-5. Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity: Goals and Assessment of Progress

#### Goal 1: “Create a community that values diversity.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The degree of commitment to this goal is expressed by the president in his statements to the community.</td>
<td>• Funds were cut for two diversity speakers’ series. Even though the various offices continue programming, many of these utilize videos, rather than bringing in educational speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is increased attendance at diversity-related events by senior officers (especially academic deans).</td>
<td>• Some students of color have expressed that they still do not feel CMU is truly their university because of the way they are treated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There exists co-sponsorship of these events by departments outside of the diversity unit.</td>
<td>• Although Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender (GLBT) students are less visible and less vocal, they also express concerns about the campus climate not being very hospitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is greater diversity of background among senior officers.</td>
<td>• A president’s award for faculty or staff who excel in promoting diversity has been established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A campus climate advisory committee was created.</td>
<td>• The Office of International Education now reports to the associate vice president for diversity and international education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reports on the state of diversity are made.</td>
<td>• Advocacy by a student group led to CMU now recognizing Martin Luther King Day by suspension of classes to permit a day of diversity programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A president’s award for faculty or staff who excel in promoting diversity has been established.</td>
<td>• The Multicultural Leadership Program for faculty is on hold for budgetary reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Office of International Education now reports to the associate vice president for diversity and international education.</td>
<td>• There continues to be a relatively high turnover rate in staff members with diverse backgrounds, particularly the younger staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocacy by a student group led to CMU now recognizing Martin Luther King Day by suspension of classes to permit a day of diversity programming.</td>
<td>• Personnel cuts in all of the diversity-related units have been made within the last two years as the university has undergone severe budget cuts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Goal 2: “Recruit and support the administration and organizational structure needed to coordinate and monitor campus climate.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major positive changes to the structure needed to monitor progress on creating a more welcoming community for people from a diversity of backgrounds have been made:</td>
<td>• Personnel cuts in all of the diversity-related units have been made within the last two years as the university has undergone severe budget cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The creation of the position of associate vice president for diversity and international education,</td>
<td>• Personnel cuts in all of the diversity-related units have been made within the last two years as the university has undergone severe budget cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The improved definition of the roles of the affirmative action officer and AVP for diversity and international education,</td>
<td>• Personnel cuts in all of the diversity-related units have been made within the last two years as the university has undergone severe budget cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The location of the Office of International Education under the umbrella of the diversity unit,</td>
<td>• Personnel cuts in all of the diversity-related units have been made within the last two years as the university has undergone severe budget cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the transfer of the reporting of the affirmative action office to the president’s division.</td>
<td>• Personnel cuts in all of the diversity-related units have been made within the last two years as the university has undergone severe budget cuts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Goal 3: “Recruit, hire, retain and promote faculty and staff who will enhance diversity across all levels and areas of the university.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The number of staff and faculty from diverse backgrounds continues to increase.</td>
<td>• The Multicultural Leadership Program for faculty is on hold for budgetary reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Position advertisements are now placed in publications of special interest to members of underrepresented groups.</td>
<td>• There continues to be a relatively high turnover rate in staff members with diverse backgrounds, particularly the younger staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A mentoring program for staff from diverse backgrounds has been started.</td>
<td>• The continuing low on-campus enrollment of students from underrepresented groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Goal 4: “Recruit and retain students from a diversity of backgrounds, especially those from underrepresented groups.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The number of underrepresented students both recruited and retained continues to increase.</td>
<td>• The lower freshman-to-sophomore retention rate and the six-year graduation rate for students of diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In addition to the ongoing King/Chavez/Parks College Day Program, CMU administers a Gear Up Program in Flint, an Upward Bound Program in Detroit, a summer program for Native American pre-college students, and a McNair Summer Scholars program for undergraduate students interested in pursuing graduate study.</td>
<td>• The lower rates of on-campus bachelors and higher degrees granted to students of diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CMU is regularly recognized as one of the top two U.S. universities in granting graduate degrees to African-American and Hispanic students.</td>
<td>• The lower rates of on-campus bachelors and higher degrees granted to students of diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several campus members have expressed the feeling that progress would be greatly improved if more people saw diversity not as a series of initiatives for people from underrepresented groups, but as an initiative of concern to everyone on campus similar to our striving to attain academic excellence in our educational programs and service excellence in the support units. It is hoped that this can be addressed by CMU 2010 as CMU takes action on its institutional priority to “Provide educational experiences that enhance diversity and global perspectives.” One planned activity is a team approach by the Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching and the Multicultural Education Center to co-develop resources to help faculty (1) use pedagogical means to encourage student appreciation for diverse perspectives and (2) deal with challenges that arise from relationship dynamics when students disagree and how to encourage students to maintain respect for one another’s privilege to express their opinions.

Committee,26 the reports by MDEC to the Academic Senate and its executive board in Spring 2004,27 the MDEC annual reports for 2003-04 and 2004-05,28 and findings from focus groups composed of students from underrepresented groups.

### Table 3-5. Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity: Goals and Assessment of Progress (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5: “Provide professional development activities that assist all personnel in the understanding of their own and other cultures.”</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There has been an increase in professional development activities related to diversity issues:</td>
<td>- All new staff members are required to attend a 2-hour diversity training session.</td>
<td>- Relatively low faculty and staff participation in training other than what is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prejudice Reduction workshops, Winning Balance workshops and other opportunities are provided through the Multicultural Education Center, as well as Employee Relations and Training in Human Resources.</td>
<td>- Faculty and staff perceptions that diversity training is not needed because everyone already values diversity.</td>
<td>- The lack of personnel needed to carry out a truly systematic diversity training program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As part of the Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity, a campuswide committee developed a series of goals and objectives for diversity training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 6: “Infuse diversity into the curriculum and promote pedagogical strategies that encourage student involvement and facilitate respect of diverse perspectives.”</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The second of CMU’s present institutional priorities is to “provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and global perspectives.”</td>
<td>- Little progress has been made in this area. Virtually the only effort is the Seeking Education Equity and Diversity (SEED) Seminar, in which few faculty participate and which has not received any funding since the approval of the Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A recent change to the general education program gives students an incentive to participate in study abroad by requiring fewer hours in the university program for students who do participate.</td>
<td>- Funding for faculty who develop study abroad programs has been cut, as was a program that funded curricular initiatives focusing on diversity within the United States.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

27 academic senate.cmich.edu/SenateMinutes/Senate_Minutes_3-30-04.doc &
academic senate.cmich.edu/ExecMinutes/Senate_E-Board_Minutes_1-30-04.doc
CMU uses its special relationship with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe to promote awareness of Native American culture

Great attention has been given to CMU’s relationship with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe because of CMU’s proximity to the reservation and the university’s use of “Chippewas” as its athletic nickname. In 2002, a resolution regarding this relationship was signed by the two parties.  

CMU adopted the Chippewa nickname in 1942. Serious consideration was given in 1989 to changing the nickname following a recommendation by the Michigan Civil Rights Commission that schools refrain from using nicknames based on ethnic groups. After much discussion, it was decided to retain “Chippewas” but with specific conditions, i.e., to develop educational programs in conjunction with the tribe, to familiarize CMU students and staff with traditional Native American culture, and to eliminate the use of stereotypical logos and symbols. A more expanded history of relations between CMU and the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe is provided in Appendix 3-2.  

Activities to familiarize CMU students and community with Native American, and in particular Chippewa, culture have included an annual Native American week, on-campus powwows, and speeches by tribal leaders to incoming freshman classes on “what it means to be a Chippewa.”  

In 2003, President Rao formed the President’s Advisory Committee on Native American Educational Initiatives 2003–2005. The committee is charged with advising the president on strategies and models to develop educational programs, to recruit native students, faculty and staff, to facilitate cooperation with the Tribe, and to support the Tribal College. In addition, the committee monitors CMU’s compliance with the ten conditions for using the Chippewa nickname and annually reviews CMU’s relationship with the Tribe.  

EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 1B

Between 2000 and 2002, CMU adopted several statements within its mission documents that strongly express the university’s commitment to promoting diversity and multiculturalism. Follow-through on this commitment began with the adoption of a Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity and the resulting actions taken including creation of an Associate Vice President for Diversity and International Education. Modest gains have been made in increasing diversity on-campus. The president has been a strong advocate for the need for diversity on-campus, and CMU’s relationship with the Saginaw Chippewa

29 www.diversity.cmich.edu/nativ/CMU=TribeResolution.pdf  
30 aistm.org/1988michigan.htm  
31 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Appendix3-2.pdf  
32 Available in Resource Room.
Indian Tribe has improved considerably as the result of the better communication he instituted.

Overall, progress has been slow in achieving the goals laid out within the diversity plan. CMU is still far from achieving its targets for a more diverse student body and a more diverse staff and faculty, and some attribute this to a lack of widespread support. More campus awareness of both progress and challenges in reaching diversity goals is needed. These concerns are being addressed through CMU 2010. “Provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and global perspectives” has been adopted as one of the five institutional priorities for 2005–2010; strategies to accomplish this priority and key performance indicators to track progress have been identified.

**CORE COMPONENT 1C**

**Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.**

CMU recognizes that campuswide understanding and support for its mission are best achieved through the direct involvement of campus members in the mission development process and in university decision-making in general. Additionally, the university has attempted to anchor the majority of its planning processes to its mission statements, thereby creating a unified focus that aligns efforts across departments, colleges, and divisions. That the mission statements guide strategic decision-making was recently demonstrated in two significant ways: how CMU reacted to budget difficulties following substantial callbacks of state appropriations and the manner in which CMU developed *CMU 2010*.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

*The university community was extensively involved in developing the mission documents*

When Michael Rao assumed the presidency in 2000, one of his early requests was to ask the university community to identify its core values. President Rao stressed the importance of campus-derived values. In his view, core values form the basis for the university’s sense of direction and assist with planning. This request set in motion a campus-inclusive process of inquiry into values and priorities. Twelve core values and seven institutional priorities emerged from this process; these then guided the revision of the university mission statement and associated university goals. A more detailed description of the history of the mission revision process can be found in Appendix 3-3.

This campuswide participation in the development of mission documents marked a change from previous practice that mainly involved the Board of Trustees and senior administrative officers. The practice of involving the campus community continued with the
development of CMU 2010, which is described throughout this and the
next chapter, Chapter 2, Preparing for the Future.

**The university's mission guides the president’s strategic planning**

Following his first year as president, Michael Rao made a public
statement detailing his short-term plans for the university. His 2001-02
Strategic Vision has been updated annually since then. In these plans,
President Rao uses the university’s mission, core values and institutional
priorities as well as the university vision statement to develop direction.
In addition, President Rao develops specific yearly goals. The president’s
strategic vision statements and related presidential goals are publicly
available at the president’s Web pages. Unfortunately, the terminology
“Strategic Vision” has led to some confusion between the presidential
goals and the university’s vision statement. In CMU 2010 there is an
intentional alignment of all planning-related terminology.

**Unit planning is mission-driven**

The foundation for planning throughout the university is now CMU
2010. The plan is based on five institutional priorities that correspond to
the four basic components of the vision statement: integrity, academic
excellence, research and creative activity, and public service.

The five university division and individual units tie their planning to
CMU 2010. As examples,

- In the academic division all proposals for new academic programs
must address seven evaluative criteria, the first of which deals with
the fit of the proposed program with the university mission. The
relationship to mission is especially reviewed when planning new
doctoral programs.

- The Finance and Administrative Services (FAS) division initiated
a division-wide strategic planning process in 2004 with full
implementation scheduled for August 2005. Each director is to
periodically develop goals/outcomes aligned with the university
mission and divisional priorities and to assess progress. The FAS
Division Strategic Planning process will be ongoing with monthly,
quarterly, and yearly reviews.

- The ad hoc Academic, Residence Life and Student Affairs Liaison
Committee was formed to study how students’ out-of-class
experiences can be used to support the university’s mission.

- President Rao established goal teams in 2002 to evaluate how to
advance the institutional priorities then in place. There were teams
focusing on academic excellence, off-campus programs, diversity
and international education, facilities and the physical learning

---

35 [www.cmich.edu/president/vision-goals.html](http://www.cmich.edu/president/vision-goals.html)
36 [www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/APC/APCevalguide.pdf](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/APC/APCevalguide.pdf)
37 [www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/APC/GuidlinesforNewDoctProgs.pdf](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/APC/GuidlinesforNewDoctProgs.pdf)
38 Available in Resource Room.
environment, president’s advisory boards, research and graduate education, revenue planning, and teacher education.

The university’s mission documents guided CMU’s response to its budget difficulties

For an extended period of CMU’s history, incoming funds from the state provided steady support, increasing incrementally year after year. However, beginning in 2002, state allocations took a serious downturn. Both reductions in allocations and midyear callbacks were instituted. The recent decline in state appropriations is shown in Figure 3-1. These reductions, coupled with normal growth in operating costs, forced a $24.4 million reduction in the general fund budget over the past two years.

In response to state reductions, President Rao established the Senior Staff Budget Advisory Group (SSBAG). Chaired by the provost, the group consists of senior administrators including all of the academic deans. Guidelines from the president to the SSBAG in November 2003 were:

- Maintain confidentiality and follow communication guidelines,
- Identify and eliminate inefficiencies,
- Avoid across-the-board cuts,
- Be honest and willing to make the difficult recommendations,
- Think in terms of budget changes over the next two to three years with impact over longer time,
- Place an emphasis on changes that will make the university stronger and more successful in future years,
- Make budget recommendations that reflect the mission, goals, and values of the university,
- Use data to make recommendations and decisions,
- Review all cost centers,
- Strive to maintain current numbers of tenure-track faculty and graduate assistants,
- Consider shifting resources, including faculty tracks and graduate assistant assignments, to achieve greater efficiency,
- Identify resources to achieve annual enrollment growth of at least one percent,
- Provide the institution with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the instructional needs of a growing student body, and
- Maintain CMU’s ranking as a doctoral/research-intensive university with an NCAA Division I-A athletics program.

The guidelines required that decisions be made in accordance with CMU’s mission (the bold text indicates references to CMU’s mission

39 www.budget.cmich.edu:8080/budgetUpdate/mainPage.html
40 While this guideline seems to contradict CMU’s policy of open communication, it reflects the fact that the budget reduction discussions would necessarily include the elimination of positions.
statements). Thus, although painful budget cuts were necessary, they were not made according to an across-the-board process. This was a more difficult route to take since across-the-board cuts can be easier to defend.

_The campus community is aware of and generally supportive of the university mission_

Ideally, all university employees would clearly understand the basic mission and direction of the university. Although this is difficult in practice, there is good anecdotal evidence that in general the CMU community understands and supports the university’s mission. CMU has made significant efforts to help employees and students become aware of the mission documents:

- The campus community has been directly involved in developing the mission documents.
- Professional development programs and staff performance reviews are mission-based.
- New faculty orientation includes the role of the mission and vision in faculty professional life.\(^\text{41}\)
- References to the mission are found within bargaining unit contracts.\(^\text{42}\)
- The mission is central to employee training through the Human Resources (HR) unit, which recently implemented a system known as “Performance Management.” “Performance Management” directly links job evaluation parameters to the university’s core values.\(^\text{43}\)
- Administrative staff are evaluated on their performance objectives, which are based on mission goals.

One problem in this regard has been that the multiple components of the mission documents coupled with past inconsistent use of terminology produced some confusion within the campus community. This issue is addressed in _CMU 2010_, which includes definitions of terms.\(^\text{44}\)

**EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 1C**

In general, the campus community understands and supports the university’s mission. This is more true now than it has been in the past as the result of efforts to involve the campus in the mission and vision development. As well, the mission documents are more tightly woven

---

\(^{41}\) www.provost.cmich.edu/orientation/online/welcome.htm


\(^{43}\) www.hrs.cmich.edu/er/perf-mgt.htm

\(^{44}\) www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VisionPlanning/VisionPlanApproved.pdf, page 5
into university functions such as professional development, orientation programs, unit planning, and employee review processes. Most planning is mission based.

There remains a certain amount of misunderstanding of the mission documents caused by their multiple components and past lack of consistent use of terminology.

**CORE COMPONENT 1D**

The organization’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

Effective governance and administrative structures make the pursuit of an institution’s mission possible. Such structures must be rigid enough to guide the institution as it seeks to fulfill its mission, yet flexible enough to accommodate both internal and external changes that inevitably occur. Ideally, governance and administrative structures should allow for maximum input from all corners of campus in ways that appropriately improve the institution and its practices.

In CMU’s case, governance and administrative structures have evolved throughout its history, adapting to meet institutional needs as the university has changed. This part of CMU’s history demonstrates the central role of the university’s mission in guiding actions; governance and administrative practices are mission-driven. As discussed more fully in this section, the development of a shared governance matrix has clarified the decision-making processes at CMU. This allows broad-based support for focusing on CMU’s mission. However, although this formalized structure exists, there are continuing debates concerning decision-making.

For a specific description of CMU’s governance structure, refer to the “Organizational Structure and Governance” section in Chapter 1.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

*Policies and practices of the Board of Trustees document its focus on CMU’s mission*

As governed through its charter and bylaws, the Board of Trustees is charged with overseeing the university’s mission. The board formally adopts the university mission statements, which then become the guiding force behind board decisions and policies.
The board enables CMU’s chief administrative personnel to exercise effective leadership

Article IV of the board’s bylaws delegates authority to the president and chief administrative personnel to “carry out Board policy and attend to the general administration of the university.” This protocol enables the president to design administrative structure as he sees fit, providing him the authority to make leadership decisions that most effectively accomplish mission goals.

When Michael Rao joined the university as president in July 2000, he quickly established an administrative structure that would support his leadership philosophy. President Rao instituted strategic planning as a central part of his administrative style, building upon the university’s mission documents with a series of annual strategic vision updates and goals. These presidential goals are distinct and separate from the goals of the mission statement, and represent short-term, focused goals derived from core values and institutional priorities. President Rao’s practice of annually setting goals maintains focus on university needs and issues.

In January 2004, the Board of Trustees used both campus feedback and their own assessments of President Rao’s performance to evaluate his efficacy as president. The leadership qualities identified prior to the search process that resulted in Rao’s hire were central in the evaluation. These qualities included: effective and visionary leadership, academic leadership, and demonstrated leadership in external affairs and in the area of diversity. Results of the evaluation were very positive and indicated a high level of confidence across campus as well as within the board with regard to Michael Rao’s leadership.

Responsibilities and decision-making are distributed appropriately

The distribution of responsibilities for governance and decision-making has been formally described.

CMU has had a long tradition of strong shared governance, but difficulties and disputes arose in too many instances. This problem prompted the last NCA accreditation site team to recommend corrective action.

The university examined its shared governance difficulties. In its May 1999 survey-based report, the governance committee revealed significant differences between faculty and administrators in their perspectives on shared governance. Specifically, perspectives differed in terms of what shared governance is at CMU and the extent to which shared governance exists. These findings subsequently led to the creation of a comprehensive joint governance document.

47 www.cmich.edu/president/vision-goals.html
Shared Governance Matrix\(^49\) outlined the governing roles (decides, formally recommends, provides input, is kept informed) for the Board of Trustees, the president and other senior officers, other administrative staff, the Academic Senate, colleges and departments, collective bargaining units, and students. The matrix was endorsed by the Academic Senate on April 30, 2002\(^50\) and serves as a shared governance guide.

In brief, the major groups with responsibilities in the university’s governance are (1) the administration and, to a lesser extent, the Board of Trustees, (2) the Academic Senate, (3) and the collective bargaining units, with strong influence by the unit representing faculty (the Faculty Association). These groups participate in university governance as follows:

- The administrative units are charged with managing the day-to-day activities of the institution as well as planning how to achieve the mission and goals of the university, under the general guidance of the Board of Trustees.

- The Academic Senate\(^51\) serves as the university’s final curricular authority and a policy-making body for a range of issues involving academic life at the university. The senate’s membership consists of representatives elected by academic departments as well as student representatives, academic deans, the provost and the president; much of the work of the senate takes place through committees that report findings to the senate body for discussion and in appropriate cases, voting.

- The bargaining units have the responsibility to protect and advance the interests of their members, as defined through negotiated agreements.

Despite the matrix, there are still controversies on shared governance. Part of this arises from different views on the purpose of the matrix. Some see it as prescriptive — defining exactly how decisions will be made — while others view it as descriptive — describing how decisions have been made but allowing revisions as times and conditions change. Further complicating the situation is the fact that one of the three major constituencies, the Academic Senate, formally adopted (April 24, 2001) a set of Principles of Shared Governance\(^52\) that delineate its interpretation, but these have not been formally endorsed by the other groups.

\(^49\) www.provost.cmich.edu/docs/expanded-shared-governance.pdf
\(^50\) academicsenate.cmich.edu/SenateMinutes/Senate_Minutes-04-30-02.doc
\(^51\) academicsenate.cmich.edu/
\(^52\) academicsenate.cmich.edu/NonCad/Principles_of_Shared_Governance_revised_4-1-02.doc
Most authority for financial decision-making rests with affected units

A transition to a responsibility center management (RCM) budget model was implemented at CMU beginning July 1, 1998 (the change was called “budget restructuring”). The principles embraced by this initiative resulted in a new approach to budgeting for the university. This model resulted in a far greater degree of delegated budgetary authority, especially in the academic division. It also led to units being given more decision-making authority.53 A review and assessment of how RCM is working is currently underway.

A contracting authority document54 identifies which university positions have authority to sign contracts on behalf of CMU.

The president is primarily responsible for external affairs

The complex nature of a modern university makes it impossible for a president to manage effectively both the external and internal affairs of a major institution. This was recognized by President Rao, who reorganized the executive administration to permit focus of his time and energy on external affairs as he outlines in Presidential Update #5.55 A key element was the creation of the position of provost and executive vice president, replacing the former vice president for academic affairs position. This change effectively reorganized the upper levels of administration so that the executive vice president is largely responsible for internal affairs with oversight by the president.

CMU hires individuals qualified to carry out their responsibilities

Essential for accomplishing an institution’s mission is having leaders who are qualified to carry out their assigned responsibilities. CMU has procedures in place to assure that appropriately qualified individuals are hired and that they maintain their effectiveness throughout their employment.

Faculty

Faculty are the primary agents involved in carrying out the academic mission of the university. As discussed in Chapter 5, Student Learning and Effective Teaching, the selection process is thorough and emphasizes consideration of candidates who are effective teachers and scholars.

Faculty are regularly evaluated. Prior to becoming tenured, faculty are reviewed annually. After becoming tenured, faculty are reviewed at least every five years according to each faculty member’s contract.

53 Examples are in Appendix 3-4 (www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Appendix3-4.pdf)
54 www.cmich.edu/gencounsel/manual/Contracting_Authority_Procedures.pdf
55 www.cmich.edu/president/update5.html
Administrators and staff

The hiring process for senior administrators is conducted openly. Committees make recommendations and conduct background checks. Human Resources oversees the process for hiring qualified staff based on job descriptions\(^6\) that define required and desired qualifications for individual positions and fulfill affirmative action requirements.\(^7\)

In an effort to move toward a more goal-driven and competency-based organization, Central Michigan University has adopted a “Performance Management” process\(^8\) for senior officers and upper-level professional-administrative employees to ensure effective communication between supervisor and employee, encourage quality work performance, and identify clear performance expectations. Employees and supervisors agree on annual objectives and measures based on unit and university priorities.

Communication structures enable CMU’s administration to maintain awareness of campus concerns

At CMU, any individual or group is able to communicate directly with senior administrators and the Board of Trustees.

- Communication with the Board of Trustees: Board meetings are open to the public, and meeting schedules are published on the university Web site and in both the university newspaper and the local newspaper that serves the city of Mt. Pleasant and surrounding areas. Individuals may speak directly to the board at these meetings, or they may approach the board through one of two standing committees that the board maintains: one that serves as a liaison between the board and the faculty, and a second that serves as a liaison between the board and the student body.

- Communication with the president: President Rao makes himself available through regular open forums that are specifically geared toward soliciting feedback from campus and community members. His presidential updates, announced through an e-mail news update system and published on the CMU Web site, keep the campus informed of important events, issues and announcements. President Rao publicly encourages any member of the campus community to contact him directly via e-mail.

- The University Community Advisory Panel\(^9\) (UCAP), composed of representatives of campus employee groups, meets regularly with the president. UCAP goes beyond acting as a sounding board for campus issues; it also works to strategize better campus operations.

\(^6\) [www.jobs.cmich.edu/applicants/jsp/shared/frameset/Frameset.jsp?time=1106159823015](http://www.jobs.cmich.edu/applicants/jsp/shared/frameset/Frameset.jsp?time=1106159823015)

\(^7\) [www.cmich.edu/aaeo/equal-op-aa-protocol.htm](http://www.cmich.edu/aaeo/equal-op-aa-protocol.htm)

\(^8\) [www.hrs.cmich.edu/er/perf-mgt.htm](http://www.hrs.cmich.edu/er/perf-mgt.htm)

\(^9\) [www.cmich.edu/ucap/](http://www.cmich.edu/ucap/)
Open sessions are held with candidates for senior positions. Faculty and staff are notified by the daily e-mail announcements, and notice is also placed in the campus newspaper. The screening committees solicit and consider the views of those attending the open sessions.

Faculty hold both authority over and responsibility for CMU’s curriculum

Faculty govern academic policies and curricular matters; the Academic Senate acts as the central governing body for faculty work in these areas. The *Curricular Authority Document* stipulates policies for curriculum development, and four Academic Senate committees review curricular proposals: the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Council, the Professional Education Curriculum Committee, and the General Education Subcommittee. The details involving curricular processes at CMU are discussed in Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching*, and Appendix 5-1.

CMU assesses the effectiveness of its structures and processes

Self-evaluation is evident at many levels and is becoming more systematic. Several examples of self-assessment that led to significant institutional changes include:

- In 1995, a committee was formed to review the structure of the academic division. This led to a major reorganization of the colleges with the creation of a College of Health Professions, the division of Arts and Sciences into three colleges, and the relocation of several departments into different colleges. Evaluation of the changes in 2000 found that while most felt that the reorganization had not had dramatic effects — either positive or negative — there was some indication of success in improving student recruitment, alumni loyalty, interdisciplinary efforts, and program visibility.

- In the mid-1990s, there was a perception that a new budget model was desirable. A study led to the implementation of the Responsibility Center Management budget model described above. The success of this has been closely monitored and several modifications made as problems were discovered. A systematic review is underway. The RCM initiative is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, *Preparing for the Future*.

- Feedback from an NCATE review led to a restructuring of professional education designed to improve operations and clarify lines of authority.

---

60 academicsenate.cmich.edu/cad.htm
61 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Appendix5-1.pdf
In response to deficiencies identified in the assessment of student learning outcomes, significant investments have been made to address these concerns. Major progress has been made as discussed in Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching*.

CMU regularly collects and analyzes data relative to student achievement and uses this information to improve its operations. As examples,

- The College Student Inventory is annually administered to all freshmen living in the residence halls and used to improve student advising.
- The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is regularly administered and used to evaluate such areas as academic efforts, co-curricular activities and other areas of student engagement.
- CMU is one of 50 higher education institutions participating in a four-year longitudinal study funded by the Lumina Foundation that is aimed at understanding more about student learning.

**EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 1D**

Many aspects of governance at CMU work well and are aligned with the institution’s mission and vision. Communication is a strong feature of the Rao administration. There is a long tradition of shared governance, which has been described in a formal shared governance matrix that outlines the structure of decision-making at CMU. Nevertheless, various campus leaders — particularly in the faculty and the administration — have different perceptions about the role and value of the governance matrix.

**CORE COMPONENT 1E**

The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

CMU takes seriously its responsibility to abide by the laws and regulations of the state of Michigan, the federal government, and other governing and regulating bodies. Its historical good practices and lack of citations and investigations are testimony of CMU’s integrity.

CMU’s integrity also rests on the transparency of its actions and the extent to which it does what it says it plans to do. This encompasses CMU’s willingness to be honest and fair in representing itself and in conducting its business.

Finally, CMU’s integrity rests on its follow-through with respect to its mission and vision statements. In this respect, trust depends on the transparency of university actions and the extent to which they are aligned with its mission and vision. It is important to note here that one of the five institutional priorities in *CMU 2010* is to “strengthen the institution’s culture of integrity.” CMU’s strong commitment to this ideal is also illustrated by the candid approach used throughout this self-study report.
EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

The Board of Trustees ensures that CMU operates legally, responsibly, and with fiscal integrity

Article II, section 1 of the Central Michigan University Board of Trustees Bylaws states: “The business and affairs of the university are governed by the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees has all of the powers accorded it by the Constitution of the State of Michigan, Act 48 of Michigan Public Acts of 1963 (second extra session) and any other legislation conferring powers upon the Board.” Article V, section 1 of the bylaws states the key responsibilities of the board, which include “ensuring financial solvency,” and “maintaining the appropriate relationship between the University and the public it serves.”

The board’s authority includes oversight of an annual financial audit of the university. Responsibility for the audit falls to the Finance and Audit Committee of the board. The audit is conducted annually as of June 30 and is performed by an independent firm, Andrews Hooper & Pavlik P.L.C. Audits for the past several years are available online. There is no history of concerns by CMU’s external auditors with respect to the financial status of the university.

Two university offices work closely with the board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities.

- The Office of General Counsel represents CMU and the Board of Trustees in legal matters. Its mission is “to provide, or arrange for providing, reliable legal advice and support to offices of the University, to assist in avoiding institutional and employee legal liability and defending against claims.”

- Internal Audit is “one of the ways by which Central Michigan University maintains the integrity, efficiency, and effectiveness of financial and other management control systems.” Although Internal Audit is an integral part of the organization, it functions independently of all other divisions and departments to permit the work to be performed freely and objectively. Most of the auditing work results in recommendations for improving practices in the units that are reviewed. The current director reports that there have been no major incidents of fraud or intentional disregard for university policies since he came to CMU in 1992. A few minor cases of fraud, primarily in student organizations, prompted the establishment of a confidential reporting hotline in 2005.

63  www.cmich.edu/trustees/bylaws/b.05-0714.pdf
64  www.controller.cmich.edu/Accounting/financial_reports.htm
65  www.cmich.edu/gencounsel/default.htm
66  www.ia.cmich.edu/
**CMU abides by applicable laws and regulations**

As a public institution, CMU must abide by myriad of local, state and federal laws and regulations. CMU meets all such demands and publicly maintains policies and procedures that cover such responsibilities. Below are several examples of ways that CMU fulfills this commitment. Lists of CMU policies are maintained by the Office of General Counsel and by Human Resources.

**Workplace Safety**

The safety of students, employees and visitors to the campus is of paramount importance. CMU has developed a comprehensive set of policies to assure safe workplace practices. The Department of Environmental & Safety Services (ESS) is responsible for maintaining a safe workplace environment and for conforming to the regulations of the Michigan Occupational Safety and Health Administration (MIOSHA). ESS interacts with the MIOSHA regulators, conducts job safety analyses, writes and updates health and safety plans, researches regulations, conducts regulatory audits, maintains the Material Safety Data Sheet inventory, investigates safety-related complaints and accidents, and conducts health and safety training (e.g., for the College of Science and Technology).

**Public Health**

CMU is proactive in protecting and promoting the health and well-being of its students, employees and visitors. Policies include those related to maintaining a drug-free environment and smoke-free environment, legal and safe consumption of alcoholic beverages, and the Family Medical Leave Act. In addition, CMU promotes wellness through a number of programs and activities.

**Employee Rights**

Policies are in place to abide by regulations governing student and employee rights including privacy rights. Examples include policies centered on the following legislation: the Family Education and Privacy Act and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

**Non-Discrimination**

CMU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity institution that strongly and actively strives to increase diversity and provide equal opportunity within its community. CMU does not discriminate against persons based on age, color, disability, gender, familial status, height, marital status, national origin, political persuasion, race, religion, sexual orientation, veteran status, or weight. The Affirmative Action Office coordinates and monitors the university’s affirmative action/equal opportunity efforts and programs to assure compliance with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Executive Order 11246 and other relevant

---

67 [www.ess.cmich.edu](http://www.ess.cmich.edu/)
68 [www.ess.cmich.edu/MIOSHA ON CAMPUS/2MIOSHA ON CAMPUS POLICY 2004.doc](http://www.ess.cmich.edu/MIOSHA ON CAMPUS/2MIOSHA ON CAMPUS POLICY 2004.doc)
69 [www.cst.cmich.edu/safety/default.htm](http://www.cst.cmich.edu/safety/default.htm)
70 [www hrs.cmich.edu/download-files/supervisor-fmla-training03-04.ppt](http://www hrs.cmich.edu/download-files/supervisor-fmla-training03-04.ppt)
71 [www.hipaa.cmich.edu/](http://www.hipaa.cmich.edu/)
72 [www.cmich.edu/aaeo/](http://www.cmich.edu/aaeo/)
state and federal non-discrimination statutes. The unit investigates complaints and is also tasked with taking specific and results-oriented measures to bring about equal opportunity. About 150 complaints from faculty, staff and students are filed and investigated each year.

CMU proactively works to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Michigan law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability. An aggressive program to assure access to both facilities and programs has been undertaken; nearly a million dollars of renovations have occurred in the past ten years. A steering committee was established to oversee the university’s effort and to ensure training for faculty and staff in compliance with directives. The university has also expanded the Office of Student Disability Services73 to include a full-time director, a part-time learning disabilities specialist and an adaptive technologies technician to maximize students’ abilities to participate in all campus curricula.

**NCAA Compliance**

CMU athletic programs are subjected to regular reviews for compliance with the NCAA policies. The most recent comprehensive review took place in 2003–05. CMU’s self-study found no significant violations, although recommendations for change were made in a few areas.

**Student Financial Aid**

CMU presently awards $132 million in financial aid to students, of which $37.8 million are scholarships or grants. Of these, $14.8 million come from federal funds and $8.8 million come from the state of Michigan. Financial aid programs are, of course, tightly regulated and subject to strict scrutiny. The regulations on externally derived funds cover both the amounts of awards and also the eligibility of recipients, while internal policies ensure that we are not capricious in our discretionary awards.

The Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid is required to provide detailed annual reports both to the U.S. Department of Education and to the state of Michigan. The office is also audited annually by Internal Audit and every few years by the state. No concerns have been raised by governmental officials or the auditors, although internal procedures detected one case of an employee falsifying records in order to retain eligibility for federal financial aid. Policies and procedures have subsequently been revised to address and prevent potential future misconduct.74

---

73  www.cmich.edu/student-disability/
74  Interview with Diane Fleming, Associate Director for Client Services, Scholarships & Financial Aid, June 8, 2005

*CMU maintains clear and fair policies regarding the rights and responsibilities of each of its internal constituencies*

In addition to externally mandated regulations, CMU has internal policies designed to protect persons and property, ensure ethical conduct and provide due process in disputes. Some examples
include policies on expected student behavior\textsuperscript{75} (e.g., alcohol policy, academic integrity, code of student rights, responsibilities, disciplinary procedures), the Grade Grievance Policy,\textsuperscript{76} the Conflict of Interest Policy,\textsuperscript{77} copyright,\textsuperscript{78} and computer and information technology policies.\textsuperscript{79}

CMU also maintains collective bargaining agreements\textsuperscript{80} with six employee groups, including the faculty. The contracts specify rights, responsibilities and grievance procedures for the respective groups. There are contract-like handbooks for the two non-organized employee groups. Faculty Personnel Services\textsuperscript{81} is the office dedicated to faculty personnel. Human Resources\textsuperscript{82} oversees all other employee groups.

\textit{CMU deals fairly with its external constituents}

CMU’s external constituencies include those with whom it has a business relationship as well as such groups as alumni, donors, and community leaders. To ensure fairness in university dealings with external business constituents, most of the relationships are governed by contracts and policies. Common business relationships include those with vendors, the media, affiliation agreements related to student field experiences, and articulation agreements with community colleges.\textsuperscript{83}

Dealing fairly with those external constituents without a business interest means that the university is responsive to their needs, concerns, and issues. In order to maintain more effective communication with external constituencies, President Rao established regional advisory boards comprised of alumni, donors, community leaders, and other interested parties. These boards meet periodically to keep campus leadership informed of their concerns and opinions.\textsuperscript{84} There are five such boards, each of which represents a different geographical area that is served by the university.\textsuperscript{85}

Advisory groups also exist for special areas. One focuses on improving relationships with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe. Another is concerned with building relationships and responding to the unique needs of the metropolitan Detroit community. Both of these have been high priorities for President Rao and the university community.

\textsuperscript{75} www.cmich.edu/policies-procedures/
\textsuperscript{76} academiciansenate.cmich.edu/Policy/GRAGE_GRIEVANCE_POLICY.pdf
\textsuperscript{77} www.purchasing.cmich.edu/doc/ConflictOfInterestPolicy.doc
\textsuperscript{78} www.cmich.edu/copyright/
\textsuperscript{79} www.it.cmich.edu/it/policies_home.asp
\textsuperscript{80} www.hrs.cmich.edu/contracts.htm
\textsuperscript{81} www.fps.cmich.edu/
\textsuperscript{82} www.hrs.cmich.edu/
\textsuperscript{83} Affiliation Agreements www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/affiliation.htm;
Articulation Agreements webs.cmich.edu/aga/default.asp
\textsuperscript{84} www.pab.cmich.edu/
\textsuperscript{85} www.pab.cmich.edu/
CMU takes complaints seriously and responds in a timely manner to settle grievances

Student Complaints
A centralized office, the Student Ombuds Office,\(^\text{86}\) works to resolve issues between students and university offices, departments, or individuals. Questions concerning grades, and other university matters may be aired confidentially to a professional within this office. The Ombuds Officer is trained to assist students with finding an appropriate and fair resolution of their grievances. They maintain neutrality while protecting student rights.\(^\text{87}\) The Ombuds Office has approximately 200 cases a year, some of which involve repeat visits by the same students. Complaints about grading are subject to special policies and procedures: the Grade Grievance Policy.\(^\text{88}\)

CMU’s Affirmative Action Office\(^\text{89}\) handles all incidents that involve discrimination or harassment based on age, color, disability, gender, familial status, height, marital status, national origin, political persuasion, race, religion, sexual orientation, veteran status, or weight.

Employee Complaints
All unionized employees, which include tenured and tenure-track faculty, have grievance procedures spelled out in their collective bargaining agreements.\(^\text{90}\) Non-unionized groups have similar procedures, including those specified in the Academic Senate’s Procedures for Handling Questions of Professional Concern\(^\text{91}\) available to temporary faculty, and the dispute resolution process\(^\text{92}\) for the Professional and Administrative employee group. There are also established complaint procedures for discrimination or harassment claims handled by the Affirmative Action Office.\(^\text{93}\) All procedures have established timelines to assure that concerns are addressed in a timely manner.

Complaints and Allegations from External Bodies
Complaints about CMU may be filed by any party with our accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission. Two such complaints have been filed in the past ten years, both of which were resolved to the commission’s satisfaction. CMU also routinely investigates and provides timely responses to complaints filed by individuals and other external agencies.

---

\(^\text{86}\) www.cmich.edu/ombuds/. Number of appointments from Sue Rademacher, Ombuds Officer, June 13, 2005
\(^\text{87}\) www.cmich.edu/policies-procedures/code-student-rights.htm
\(^\text{88}\) academiconsen.cmich.edu/Policy/GRADE_GRIEVANCE_POLICY.pdf
\(^\text{89}\) www.cmich.edu/aaeo/
\(^\text{90}\) www.hrs.cmich.edu/contracts.htm
\(^\text{91}\) academiconsen.cmich.edu/Policy/PROCEDURES_FOR_HANDLINGQUESTIONS_OF_PROFESIONAL_CONCERN.pdf
\(^\text{92}\) www.hrs.cmich.edu/avp/download/pa-handbook.pdf
\(^\text{93}\) www.cmich.edu/aaeo/complaint-procedures/default.htm
CMU presents itself accurately and honestly to the public

The university spends considerable effort to market itself effectively in attracting the students that it aspires to serve and in attracting donors to assist with funding. An office within Public Relations is responsible for writing, editing, and designing official university publications, particularly those for external audiences. This office also reviews publications that represent CMU before they are distributed off campus, in accordance with university policy.

CMU also maintains good relations with news media in order to effectively communicate issues, events, and other public interest items. Public relations liaisons at the college level and within the university’s public relations department work together to ensure that accurate information is made available in response to any external inquiries concerning the university, its faculty, staff, or students.

CMU practices openness in its activities

The Michigan Constitution requires that formal sessions of the governing board be open to the public. The *Central Michigan University Board of Trustees Bylaws* commit that formal sessions shall be open to the public and that final decisions that are binding on the university shall be made at formal sessions. The bylaws also provide for advance public notice of regular sessions of the board and an opportunity for anyone to address the board at any meeting.

CMU extends this practice of openness throughout its campus. A hallmark of Michael Rao’s presidency has been his openness and interest in communicating with the university and the public. Through public forums, which draw interested university and community members, as well as through written presidential updates posted on the university Web site, President Rao keeps the campus community and general public informed of important campus issues, actions, and events. This openness is employed for all key decisions. Further discussion of the administration’s efforts in communicating with the campus and the community appears in Chapter 7, *Engagement and Service*. 
The integrity of CMU's mission and vision is demonstrated through university actions

CMU has carefully-crafted mission documents that describe its purpose, what it aspires to achieve, the core values under which it operates, the central goals, and the evolving set of institutional priorities. Each component of the mission was developed with great care and considerable input from the campus community. However, having formal statements is not enough. Integrity demands that these mission statements truly guide the institution. In chapters four through seven of this self-study, which address accreditation criteria two through five, the portions of the mission statements relevant to the criterion are first identified so that the reader can readily assess and document the extent to which activities at CMU are congruent with its mission. Table 6-3 at the end of this chapter shows the specific locations within this report where each component of our mission statement is addressed.

EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 1E

CMU has a strong reputation for operating with integrity in its broadest sense and strives to strengthen this attribute as it pursues its vision. That this is a strong institutional value is demonstrated by the adoption of “strengthen the institution’s culture of integrity” as one of five institutional priorities in CMU 2010. CMU’s record is one of compliance with applicable regulations and a relatively small number of internal complaints.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

STRENGTHS

1. **Mission**: CMU has a comprehensive set mission documents.

2. **Shared Governance**: 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. **Diversity**: Enhancing diversity is an institutional priority and strategies and key performance indicators have been identified.

4. **Tribal Relations**: CMU’s relationship with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe has improved considerably over the past five years.

5. **Complaints**: CMU’s policies and procedures for addressing complaints are comprehensive and have been in place and working well for many years.

6. **Integrity**: Integrity has been adopted as a specific institutional priority.

CONCERNS

1. **Mission**: 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.

2. **Vision**: Some faculty members are not convinced that the current vision seeking national prominence aligns well with the focus needed at CMU.

3. **Budget**: Budget constraints, many of which increase workloads for faculty and staff, have made it difficult to address some institutional priorities.

4. **Shared Governance**: 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.

5. **Diversity**: Progress toward a more diverse on-campus student body as well as a more diverse faculty has been slow.

6. **Diversity Plan**: Campuswide, there is not enough awareness of how CMU is progressing on the Diversity Plan.
### CMU’s Basic Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Related Criterion or Core Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University serves Michigan and the larger community as a doctoral/research-intensive public university focused on excellent teaching and student-focused learning. The university is committed to providing a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs and services to prepare its students for varied roles as responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic and diverse society. Its programs encourage intellectual and moral growth, prepare students for meaningful careers and professions, instill the values of lifelong learning, and encourage civic responsibility, public service and understanding among social groups in a global society.</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Core Component 1B Criterion 2  Criterion 3  Criterion 4  Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university emphasizes an undergraduate program that maintains a balance between general education and specialization. In addition to educational depth in at least one academic discipline or professional field, the university provides educational experiences in the arts, humanities, natural and social sciences, global cultures, and issues of race and diversity. The university offers selected high quality graduate programs in traditional disciplines and professional fields. Through its off-campus delivery system, ProfEd, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult populations.</td>
<td>3 4 6</td>
<td>Core Component 1B  Criterion 2  Core Component 4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University encourages research, scholarship and creative activity and promotes the scholarly pursuit and dissemination of new knowledge, artistic production and applied research. Through its support of research, the university enhances the learning opportunities of both its undergraduate and graduate students and promotes economic, cultural and social development.</td>
<td>4 6 7</td>
<td>Criterion 2  Criterion 4  Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university’s sense of community is reflected through governance structures that allow broad-based participation, opportunities for close student-faculty interaction, and a rich array of residential and campus-based co-curricular activities. Through its partnerships and outreach efforts, the university promotes learning outside of the traditional classroom and enhances the general welfare of society.</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>Core Component 2  Core Component 3  Core Component 4A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CMU Core Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Core Values of CMU</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Related Criterion or Core Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student-focused learning, placing the strongest value on learning and teaching;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The scholarship of discovery and creativity, recognizing that the most basic function of the university is to seek, apply and disseminate knowledge and insights;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Liberal education as the foundation of the undergraduate curriculum, articulating this commitment in a general education program;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduate education as integral to the university experience, enhancing the learning environment for all community members and providing leadership in the area of scholarship;</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>Core Component 4A  Core Component 4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nurturing and encouraging personal growth, creating an environment that actively and deliberately supports individuals' effort to realize their potential and achieve their goals.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity and multiculturalism, bracing multiple voices, perspectives and ideas rather than the dominance of only one idea, person, faction, generation, race, culture or religion;</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>Core Component 1B  Core Component 3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A sense of community, encouraging a shared sense of belonging, the harnessing of energies and commitments to common goals, and the valuing of the contributions of all members to the whole;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect and civility in the treatment of each other, creating an atmosphere of mutual free exchange and expression of thoughts and ideas, civil discourse and conscientious actions;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared governance, supporting the principles of communication, consultation and participatory decision-making.</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>Core Component 1D  Core Component 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serving the larger community, recognizing an obligation to serve the public interest and to merge theory and practice;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional responsibility, taking seriously the impact of performance on each other, on the learning community, and upon society.</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>Core Component 4D  Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Striving for quality in all that we do, encouraging excellence in all our activities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Statement</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Related Criterion or Core Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide a quality, broad undergraduate education to prepare students for a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoughtful life of service to the community and as a base for future academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and professional work and to ensure that CMU students will be knowledgeable and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skilled, liberally educated persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offer in-depth undergraduate programs in which students can begin to master</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an academic field and practice a profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offer graduate programs in niche areas of faculty strength that meet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional, state, national and international needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourage the practice of values pertaining to professionalism, character</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and citizenship, including concern for the welfare of humanity, dedication to</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public service and awareness of the social issues confronting a diverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advance and disseminate knowledge by stimulating and supporting research</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and creative activities by students, faculty and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Design and develop innovative and effective learning systems to meet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contemporary educational needs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use modern technologies to enhance teaching, learning, research and</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative functions.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide an environment that allows for broad-based community involvement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and participation in democratic civic life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provide support services and a physical environment that foster student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Offer co-curricular activities, including Division 1A athletics, which</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance intellectual, cultural, social, ethical, physical and emotional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Create and nurture an environment that attracts and retains students,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Core Component 1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty and staff who embody and promote cultural, racial and global diversity.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provide educational experiences and programs to enhance mutual trust,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Core Component 1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect, understanding and sense of community with people from all backgrounds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and cultures and to ensure an international and global perspective.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Provide service for the public good.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Attract and manage resources to enable faculty, staff and students to</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Core Component 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be successful in meeting these goals.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In all of its activities, Central Michigan University encourages the ongoing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring of quality and the achievement of excellence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-6. Chapter Locations for Discussions of Mission, Core Values, Goals, and Institutional Priorities (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMU INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Criterion or Core Component</th>
<th>Significant Accomplishments in This Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priorities for 2000–2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising academic standards for undergraduates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3C</td>
<td>Raising academic standards project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the quality of service provided to all students</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td>Core Component 3D, Core Component 5B</td>
<td>Service excellence program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting research, scholarship and creative activity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4A</td>
<td>Increased publication and grant levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting diversity and multiculturalism</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>Core Component 1B, Core Component 3C</td>
<td>Strategic Diversity Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the learning environment through classroom, laboratory and office upgrades</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3D</td>
<td>Learning initiative for incoming class of 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing graduate education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4C</td>
<td>Expanded doctoral programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing teacher education and working collaboratively to improve traditional and innovative K-12 education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3D</td>
<td>Restructured teacher education program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priorities for 2005–2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an environment that supports teaching and learning as the top priority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Core Component 3C</td>
<td>Strategies and key performance indicators established in CMU 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and global perspectives</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Core Component 1B, Core Component 2A, Core Component 3C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the infrastructure for research and creative activity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Core Component 4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide service for the public good.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the institution's culture of integrity</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td>Core Component 1E, Core Component 4D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
CRITERION 2

The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.
CRITERION TWO

The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

No university or college can prepare for the future by continuing its actions of the past. To be effective, institutions must keep abreast of changing external conditions and adapt as necessary to continue carrying out their missions. A realistic view of the future is therefore essential.

In maintaining its own effectiveness, CMU’s planning efforts have become increasingly focused and mission-driven. Because priorities are clear, CMU plans, develops and manages its human, financial and physical resources in effective and efficient ways. CMU also maintains awareness of external trends that could impact on its graduates of the future, and makes substantial efforts to improve its offerings in order to meet future needs. CMU must, however, find ways to better coordinate the numerous levels of planning and budgeting that occur across campus to more effectively achieve long-term goals.

MISSION ELEMENTS

CMU’s mission statement indicates the university’s “commitment to providing a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs and services to prepare its students for varied roles as responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic and diverse society.” This implies a responsibility to anticipate future challenges and opportunities and to prepare for the changes that these will ultimately impose on the university. CMU recognizes the need to have a future focus, and this is made evident through significant portions of the university’s mission documents.

Several segments of the CMU mission statement clearly reflect a futuristic emphasis by CMU in expanding beyond traditional educational borders. Examples include the following excerpts:

Through its off-campus delivery service, ProfEd, the university provides access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities both nationally and internationally through a variety of innovative instructional methods and schedules designed to meet the demands of adult populations.

Through its support of research, the university enhances the learning opportunities of both its undergraduate and graduate students and promotes economic, cultural, and social development.

Through its partnerships and outreach efforts, the university promotes learning outside the traditional classroom and enhances the general welfare of society.

Additionally, CMU understands that educating today’s student requires the use of different approaches using modern technologies and support
systems. The university has made strong investments in such resources. Several goals in the mission statement reflect the intention to continue the development of new approaches to meet learning goals:

\[ \text{Goal 6: Design and develop innovative and effective learning systems to meet contemporary educational needs.} \]

\[ \text{Goal 7: Use modern technologies to enhance teaching, learning, research and administrative functions.} \]

CMU is also responsive to trends from societal, global, and economic origins, and includes statements within its mission documents to emphasize the importance of preparing its students for such trends.

\[ \text{Goal 11: Create and nurture an environment that attracts and retains students, faculty and staff who embody and promote cultural, racial and global diversity.} \]

\[ \text{Goal 12: Provide educational experiences and programs to enhance mutual trust, respect, understanding and sense of community with people from all backgrounds and cultures to ensure an international and global perspective.} \]

**CMU’S PLANNING PROCESS**

At CMU, the mission, core values, goals, and vision have become central to planning efforts. The Board of Trustees updated CMU’s vision statement in April 2004 and charged the provost with developing a campus-inclusive process for moving the institution toward its vision. Called Vision Planning, this process was coordinated by the Vision Steering Committee. It led to a minor modification of the 2004 vision statement and the identification of five institutional priorities for 2005–2010 aligned with the vision and mission statements. These priorities replaced the former set that had been in place for the previous few years.

The steering committee developed *CMU 2010*, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in March 2005. This plan outlines strategies for addressing the five priorities and key performance indicators for measuring progress. The most important recommendation that emerged from this process may be the establishment of a standing Strategic Planning Committee that will oversee the monitoring and updating of the current plan, as well as launching future campuswide planning efforts. It is too soon to see how effective this initiative will be in addressing CMU’s need for an effective strategic planning process.

**CMU’S BUDGETING PROCESS**

Decision-making with regard to budget is now more aligned with the university mission and vision than it was a decade ago. During the mid-1990s, President Plachta initiated a major budget restructuring process
with the aim of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of university operations. This resulted in the development of a budget model based on the concept of responsibility center management (RCM), which was put into operation in July 1998.

Under RCM, budgeting at CMU became decentralized, providing colleges and departments greater control over the resources generated by their units. Tuition and certain mandatory fees were allocated to colleges according to the number of student credit hours generated within colleges. Surplus funds were carried forward for future programs, program enhancements, equipment replacement and capital projects. By placing decision-making for budget expenditures in the hands of units that use those resources, this “budget restructuring plan” enabled colleges as well as individual academic departments to better manage progress toward their programmatic goals.

Unfortunately, decreasing state appropriations and callbacks required that the original model be modified. This disrupted the planning by units, especially those within the academic division, which were forced to return funds earmarked for planned projects.

Currently, a Budget Review Advisory Committee (BRAC) reviews new revenue opportunities as well as the annual budgets and operations of selected administrative service centers. During the 2003 budget crisis, the president created the Senior Staff Budget Advisory Group (SSBAG) to identify areas to be impacted by cuts. A third committee, the Budget Restructuring Review Committee (BRRC), was formed in 2004 to identify ways to improve the budgeting process itself.

**CORE COMPONENT 2A**
The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

Changing societal and economic conditions can dramatically affect an institution’s ability to maintain its effectiveness. Therefore, institutions must be able to realistically assess which external factors will be important to address, whether responses are needed, and when needed, what form a response should take.

At CMU, external changes are recognized and efforts are made to adapt the university in ways that optimize outcomes. CMU’s shared governance style of decision-making helps maintain academic integrity and focus on mission, even though the decision-making process can be slow. Although a slow response limits how quickly the university can adapt to change, it does help protect against unwise or risky changes as well as improve campus “buy-in.” As a result, generally steady adaptations are made over time rather than sudden dramatic shifts.
EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

CMU accommodates emerging trends in its planning

CMU regularly looks at societal and economic trends and makes efforts to adjust its offerings to match those that will affect its graduates. The trends listed in Table 4-1 have shaped change within CMU. CMU’s second institutional priority, “provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and global perspectives,” relates to many of these trends.

Planning for global awareness and diversity

CMU has developed undergraduate and graduate curricula designed to prepare its students for life in a more global and diverse society. From curricular planning efforts have come programs and courses that directly impact students:

- Undergraduate students are required to complete academic course work in racism and cultural diversity in the United States (Group IV-C of the University Program).
- Undergraduate students are required to take a class on global cultures (Group IV-B of the University Program).
- Several academic programs have a direct relationship to a multicultural perspective. These include the Bilingual Bicultural Education Ojibwe minor, American Ethnic Studies minor, American Indian Studies minor, Bilingual Bicultural Education Spanish minor, International Business major, Latin American Studies minor, and Women’s Studies major and minor in addition to traditional programs in Spanish, French, and German.
- In helping to prepare students to work in an international environment, CMU offers study abroad opportunities both through studies at overseas institutions and courses led by CMU faculty.
- Business students may participate in the SAP Alliance program™ that provides exposure to a management and financial package widely used by both domestic and foreign organizations.

Beyond curricular issues, diversity has been acknowledged across CMU’s campus as an area that needs to be addressed. This became clear during the campuswide discussions that led to the adoption of the university’s core values and institutional priorities. Those who participated in these discussions agreed that in order to better serve students and the state of Michigan, CMU needed to develop an environment that expressed a diversity of people, ideas, traditions, and methods of teaching and learning. As a result, promoting diversity was identified as both one of CMU’s core values and one of its institutional priorities.
Planning began by collecting and analyzing data and then developing the Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity,\(^5\) which is discussed in Core Component 1B in Chapter 3, Mission and Integrity. A task force on international education was convened to study how to address needs in this area. As a result of these planning processes, some changes in organizational structures were made in order to better tackle diversity and international education issues. CMU’s administrative structures now include these units: Office for Institutional Diversity and International Education, Native American Programs, Student Disability Services, Minority Student Services, Women’s Studies, the Multicultural Education Center, Gay & Lesbian Programs, and the Office of International Education.

### Planning for expanded modes of instructional delivery

As this country’s population ages, and demographic projections suggest a reduction in the numbers of workers in the future, it is essential that educational opportunities be made available to allow organizations and workers to adapt.

Since the early 1970s, CMU has provided nontraditional students access to higher education programs and lifelong learning opportunities through what was known until this past year as the College of Extended Learning. These programs have largely been offered at off-campus sites. A point of pride has been the relatively large numbers of students from underrepresented groups that these programs serve. However, off-campus enrollments have been declining in recent years as a result of an increasingly competitive and dynamic market for adult learners (see Figure 4-1).

In response, the former College of Extended Learning was recently restructured into a market-responsive service unit, ProfEd.\(^6\) The off-campus enrollment trends and restructuring are more fully discussed in Core Component 5A of Chapter 7, Engagement and Service.

Today’s students expect their classes to involve both traditional and nontraditional classroom teaching methods. These expectations have driven a certain amount of institutional investment in new instructional technologies. Course management software (Blackboard) facilitates communication with and the dissemination of coursework to on- and off-campus students. On the main campus in Mt. Pleasant, mediated classrooms, residential colleges, state-of-the-art library services, computer resources and new facilities have greatly improved the learning environments for students. Off-campus students are supported as well. For example, a separate Off-Campus Library Services department processes student requests and distributes items directly to the student’s off-campus location; off-campus students have their own student service units, such as for advising. More details on these and other instructional technology investments are discussed in Core Component 3D of Chapter 5, Student Learning and Effective Teaching.

---

\(^5\) [www.diversity.cmich.edu/strategicplan2.htm](http://www.diversity.cmich.edu/strategicplan2.htm)

\(^6\) [www.cel.cmich.edu/celchanges/](http://www.cel.cmich.edu/celchanges/)
Planning for future technology needs

The university plans aggressively with respect to several technology issues: increasing technology skills of its students, increasing technology use in teaching, and implementing technology as a means for streamlining university functions. Technology committees are charged with developing a comprehensive university-wide technology vision and recommending funding levels appropriate to carry out both academic and administrative technology work plans and assessments.7 A future challenge will be finding ways to continue funding the significant costs involved in keeping current in technology.

The Learning Initiative for the Incoming Class of 20028 is one direct result of this multi-committee planning structure and is targeted towards increasing the technology skills of students and increasing the use of technology in teaching. As a result of the implementation of this initiative, CMU is now a leader in creating learning environments that use instructional technology. This is discussed in detail in Core Component 3D of Chapter 5, Student Learning and Effective Teaching.

With respect to the technological enhancement of university administrative functions, the adoption of an integrated, university-wide Enterprise Resource Planning9 (ERP) system represents the outcome of planning that involved the technology committees, the Office of Information Technology, and numerous administrative units. A full discussion appears at the end of this core component section.

Planning for changing student expectations

Students residing in campus housing facilities now expect amenities such as larger rooms, additional privacy, computer labs, convenience stores, and restaurant-style dining. The university opened three new residence halls in Fall 2003 to address demands like these. Construction has started on two more residence halls (to open in Fall 2006) and on-campus landscaping improvements.10 Approval is being sought for a new electrical plant to supplement the CMU infrastructure.

Students also expect to receive services in a more efficient and effective manner. In 1995, the university centralized many of its student services within a Student Service Court where students could experience a “one-stop” service environment to deal with financial aid, advising, bursar, registrar and admissions needs. CMU instituted online registration to alleviate the manual process of course registration. The online system also provides up-to-date information related to student accounts and

---

7 These committees include the Technology Planning Board, the Administrative Technology Advisory Committee, the Faculty Technology Planning Committee, and the Distributed Computing Advisory Committee.
8 www.it.cmich.edu/docs/ftpc/cmu_Learning_Init_2002.pdf
9 ERP is an industry term for the broad set of activities supported by multi-module application software that help a manufacturer or other business manage the important parts of its business, including product planning, parts purchasing, maintaining inventories, interacting with suppliers, providing customer service, and tracking orders.
10 www.cm-life.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2005/06/01/429d2b5c923bd?in_archive=1
financial aid. Semester grades are now distributed via the Internet rather than by mail. These changes have generally been well-received.

**Planning for increased scholarship and research**

In 2003, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) coordinated development of the *Strategic Plan for Transforming Research at Central Michigan University 2004–08* using input from faculty researchers, deans, and department chairs. This plan lays out CMU’s intentions to increase the use of inquiry-, discovery-, and research-based teaching in moving its students to higher levels of mastering knowledge. The plan also lays out strategies to leverage financial support to achieve this. CMU’s progress in enhancing scholarship is discussed in Chapter 6, *Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge*, while the challenges are discussed in Chapter 8, *Special Emphasis*.

In anticipation of increased interest in research opportunities by faculty and students, the university formed the Central Michigan University Research Corporation (CMURC) in 2002. Its purpose is to actively seek external research projects and then engage students and faculty in carrying them out. The main focus is on high-tech projects of industrial interest, and some infrastructure to support this is in place. CMU, in cooperation with CMURC, received grants for a wet lab incubator addition to a research facility located in the Center for Applied Research and Technology (CART), a research park located near the Mt. Pleasant campus. The Michigan Economic Development Corporation provided $750,000 in architecture, engineering and startup operating costs and the Department of Commerce’s Economic Development Administration (EDA) has invested $2,152,000 toward construction and renovation. The CART research facility presently accommodates projects in the areas of business intelligence and data mining research and nanoscale science research and development.

**CMU prepares for the future by assessing its existing capacity**

In 2000-01, an Enrollment Management Advisory Team worked to identify and examine factors that influence enrollment change and how enrollment changes impact the university. The committee gathered data on demographic changes in Michigan, the campus infrastructure and its capacity to serve a growing number of Michigan college-bound students. A major result was the *Campus Capacity and Optimal Sizing* study, completed in June 2001 and used to build a model for analyzing enrollment effects on the overall revenue-cost balance. The team also looked at student interest in academic programs and graduate study, factors that affect CMU’s ability to enroll larger numbers of students who are members of ethnic minority groups or from other countries, and the pedagogical implications of enrollment of various sizes.

---

11  www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Research Transformation Plan 3-3-04 USE.pdf
12  www.smartzone.cmich.edu/CMURC.htm
13  www.ires2.cmich.edu/comparative/campus_capacity.pdf
CMU maintains and upgrades its physical resources through planning

CMU’s *Campus Master Plan* demonstrates a major commitment to campus physical planning. A substantial number of major facilities have been built on campus in the past ten years, which are listed in Table 4-2. The university’s top priority for the future is a new facility for teacher education. In April 2005, CMU received approval from the Michigan state legislature for $37.5 million in support of the proposed project; CMU will provide the remainder of the $50 million needed.

Table 4-2. Major New Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Building</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>100,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Athletic Complex</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>237,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Library</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>306,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three New Residence Halls</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>250,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions Building</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>173,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there has been substantial progress, there remain a number of outmoded academic facilities. These include Wightman, Sloan, Anspach, Brooks, Smith, and Moore Halls as well as Ronan Hall, the teacher education building for which a modernization project is now starting. Updating is now being planned. Perhaps of even greater concern is the fact that CMU does not have a depreciation/amortization schedule for equipment replacement. Equipment-intensive units face the possibility of having to replace expensive equipment and instrumentation without a budgeting mechanism to fund such replacements.

The Facilities Planning Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees’ Finance and Audit Committee addresses the planning and financing for major capital projects and is responsible for prioritizing future building projects. This committee was instrumental in the planning for the library and health professions facilities, and is planning the facility to house teacher education, which will involve renovation and expansion of an existing building, Ronan Hall. With input from the Student Government Association (SGA), this board subcommittee also recently allocated $3.25 million for campus improvements.

A *Long Range Facilities Management Plan* was developed in 2003 to efficiently manage and maintain the investments made in campus capital projects. This plan encompasses eight guiding principles: to preserve CMU’s academic mission, to improve condition ratings of existing facilities, to preserve existing buildings of historical and/or architectural significance, to make pedestrian-friendly spaces, to maximize facility...

---

14 [www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/CampusMasterPlan.pdf](http://www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/CampusMasterPlan.pdf) (72MB; please be patient if you are downloading)
utilization, to tie auxiliary service facilities into academic programs, to consider the impact of future growth on facility needs, and to upgrade facilities to meet emerging technological, energy, and safety needs.

The university’s commitment to addressing deferred maintenance is impressive and reflects thoughtful planning and direction from the Board of Trustees. Periodic reviews by an external entity have identified the deferred maintenance needs. The university annually budgets $4.5 million to address these needs.

An example of the success of CMU’s planning process for physical facilities is the newly renovated and expanded Park Library. Building and technology improvements, coupled with increased acquisitions, allow CMU’s library to better serve its students and faculty as well as the general public. The new facility was planned with the future in mind — not solely a book repository as in the past, but also an Internet-access location that puts users in touch with much larger resource reserves than would be possible to house on campus. Patron visits have significantly increased in the three years since the expanded and remodeled library opened in 2002, as shown in Figure 4-2.

In addition, student opinion of the improved library facility is very high, as reported on the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey in April 2003 (Figure 4-3). Compared to responses made by students from similar universities, the responses from CMU students concerning their evaluation of the adequacy of the library resources and services was higher by 0.73 points on a 7-point scale.

Also shown in Figure 4-3 are student opinion results concerning other aspects of the physical facilities at CMU. In general, students express very positive views of the campus physical plant compared to responses from students at other institutions. One exception is the feeling that student parking is inadequate. This has been a long-standing problem, and one that CMU has tried to address. Measures have included constructing new parking lots, redesigning existing lots to create more spaces, and requiring freshmen to park at remote lots. At one point the university instituted a shuttle bus system, which was ended in Fall 2003 due to budget restraints. In spite of the attempts made to resolve this issue, student opinion remains negative concerning parking.
Figure 4-3. Student Satisfaction Survey with Physical Facilities (2003 Noel-Levitz)

| Library resources and services are adequate. | \[0.2,0.6,0.4,0.8\] |
| I feel a sense of pride about my campus. | \[0.2,0.6,0.4,0.8\] |
| On the whole, the campus is well-maintained. | \[0.2,0.6,0.4,0.8\] |
| The campus is safe and secure for all students. | \[0.2,0.6,0.4,0.8\] |
| Parking lots are well-lighted and secure. | \[0.2,0.6,0.4,0.8\] |
| Living conditions in residence halls are comfortable. | \[0.2,0.6,0.4,0.8\] |
| The amount of parking space on campus is adequate. | \[0.2,0.6,0.4,0.8\] |

Mean Difference: CMU - Four-Year Public Institutions

Figure Note: Score greater than zero indicates that CMU student satisfaction is more positive compared to student satisfaction at other four-year public institutions.

**CMU is proactive in energy conservation and management**

In 2001, President Rao formed an Energy Conservation Commission to identify measures to conserve energy, increase campus awareness of the importance of energy conservation and promote individual responsibility in conserving energy at CMU. A university Web page is devoted to energy conservation. One energy initiative implemented (under the direction of Facilities Management) was the reactivation of the university’s wood chip boiler in December 2001. Estimated energy cost savings per month are approximately $100,000 with a one year or less payback period on startup costs. Standards for campus lighting have been adopted with the aim of reducing energy use.

**CMU is building a campus information handling system suited to the needs of the future.**

In 1997, the university implemented the first two modules (Finance and Human Resources) of a modern ERP system from SAP into its information systems environment. Implementation of additional modules (Campus Management and Grants Management) of this integrated system is planned for the 2005–2007, and tighter integration with financial aid, admissions, and housing systems is planned for the same time. Underlying all of this will be a Business Warehouse system developed to archive data from the various production systems. The result should be a tightly integrated system that will provide for much greater access to university information and highly optimized reporting on that information. Already, CMU has seen significant increases in efficiency in its administrative functions and has made improved management tools available to the university community.

Although the overall implementation will span the better part of a decade, the resulting system will greatly benefit the university. Accurate
data must be collected in a systematic way, analyzed, and distributed to the people who need this information in order to implement CMU’s mission and goals.

Implementation of the remaining SAP modules, including the business warehouse, enhancements to existing admissions and housing systems, and tighter process integration among these systems will provide the means for both the collection and distribution of this information. Additionally, the university’s strong relationship with SAP, the leading distributor of ERP systems in the world, should provide CMU with long service life for these systems. The planning of this enterprise speaks to CMU’s ability to deal with a large change involving numerous units. This will ultimately result in a greatly improved information technology infrastructure at CMU.

**EVAULUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 2A**

CMU is strong in the area of preparing for the future. The important trends that will impact it have been identified, and the university has invested in both physical resources and human resources to meet the demands that these trends portend. The current physical facilities are quite good and include some state-of-the-art teaching buildings although others need updating. The past 20 years have seen steady progress in achieving state support for new capital projects. A campus master plan and a deferred maintenance plans provide confidence that the university’s physical resources will continue to be able to attract and serve students well into the future. The investments in technology for teaching and administration have made CMU a leader in this area. With the exception of parking space limitations, CMU’s physical facilities are highly regarded by students. A long-needed institutional-level planning process has been implemented. There is a need for a plan and budget to handle equipment and instrumentation replacements and updating.

**CORE COMPONENT 2B**

The organization’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Any institution is limited by the resources it has available. These resources include human and physical assets as well as financial ones. Successful institutions have resources that are well matched to the intent and scope of their respective missions. In addition, their resources allow them to respond to ever-changing external pressures, continually adjusting to meet whatever current needs their targeted student populations are demanding. In making adjustments, institutions must realistically determine how their resources will best be focused in order to produce high quality services.

Like many state-supported universities, CMU has had to contend with decreasing state appropriations and callbacks in recent years. Difficult decisions have had to be made on how to allocate available resources in the wake of these reductions. In meeting this budget challenge, CMU
has demonstrated its ability to adapt to the limitations imposed on it. CMU does well in making fiscally responsible adjustments that keep institutional focus on its primary mission to provide quality education.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

**CMU is financially sound**

The university’s financial base has remained solid despite recent state cutbacks. Reductions for fiscal years 2003-04 and 2004-05 amounted to $8.5 million and $3.7 million respectively, or a total of $12.2 million in just two years. Coupled with those revenue reductions were built-in expense increases for the two fiscal years. This forced the university to reduce its operating expenditures by $24.4 million to address the reduced resource base.

In response to the budget difficulties, the president convened a Senior Staff Budget Advisory Group (SSBAG) to identify, evaluate and propose possible programming reductions in order to maintain a balanced budget. The group consisted of the academic deans, vice presidents and other senior administrators. The charge from the president specified that across-the-board cuts not be made and that all budgeted activities were to be considered. Efforts were made to maintain strong academic programming and support for CMU’s growing research efforts. For background discussion of CMU’s budgeting process, see the summary at the beginning of this chapter.

SSBAG was very successful in solving significant budget issues, despite the challenges involved. Strategic reductions were made to accommodate the revenue losses. The university’s financial health is shown in the audit report covering the financial statements for the years ending June 30, 2003 and June 30, 2004. The “Management Discussion and Analysis” section of that report in conjunction with the actual financial statement presentation provides further insight into the university’s financial condition.\(^\text{17}\)

Some other indicators of CMU’s solid financial status are:

- Institutional assets increased by 32% from 2001 to 2004, as shown in Table 4-3.
- CMU has maintained solid financial credit ratings. Moody’s Investors Service and Standard & Poor’s have assigned bond ratings of A1 and A+ respectively. The data on which the ratings are based are shown in Table 4-4.
- CMU’s debt-per-student ratio is among the lowest of Michigan institutions, as shown in Figure 4-4.\(^\text{18}\)

---

**Table 4-3. Trend in Net Assets (in Millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets</td>
<td>$262</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$318</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reported as of June 30 in the year specified.

---


\(^{18}\) Data for table available at: [www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Figure_4-3_Data.pdf](http://www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Figure_4-3_Data.pdf)
While CMU is fiscally sound, there are concerns about the potential effects of continued financial constraints, especially any additional reductions in state support for operations and capital projects or state-imposed restrictions on tuition and fee increases. There are also concerns about CMU’s increasing reliance on revenue from such auxiliary sources as residence life, ProEd, university recreation, and parking services to balance the general fund.

**CMU manages its resources to maintain its academic mission**

**Financial resources**

CMU’s operating budget for the 2004-05 fiscal year was $297 million. Figure 4-5 shows how revenue has changed over the past six years, both the total and the proportion coming from state allocations. Expenditures are shown in Figure 4-6. While the total budget has increased 31% over this period, or about 5% a year, the percentage coming from state allocations has decreased from 35% to 27%. With expenses increasing at the same time that state funding is decreasing, the university has had to expend significant effort to manage its resources effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-4. Credit Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources to Debt (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Resources to Debt (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Resources to Debt (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources per FTE ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Resources to Operations (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations per FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service to Operations (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Peer group: Selected Michigan public universities as reported by Lehman Brothers.

**Figure 4-4. Total Debt per FYES for Selected Michigan Institutions**

**Figure 4-5. Operating Budget: Revenue**

**Figure 4-6. Operating Budget: Expenditures**
In spite of budget challenges, CMU has been able to limit negative impact on academic programs and faculty positions. As Table 4-5 shows, the largest budget area is dedicated to instruction. Reductions in budget affected all divisions of the university, as shown in Table 4-6. However, although significant reductions were made in the academic division, the largest percentage cuts were made in non-academic areas.

**Competing budgetary demands**

Tight budgets and ongoing budget cuts and midyear callbacks have strained the CMU community and led to a broad call for ideas for revenue generation and opportunities for cutbacks. The ideas proposed were evaluated by SSBAG and some were adapted. Some decisions continue to fuel campus debate. The best example of this is in the area of athletics, which is outlined here for illustrative purposes.

During CMU’s recent budget difficulties, some faculty and staff expressed concern over the level of financial support provided to athletic programs. CMU is not alone in its struggle to address the appropriate role of intercollegiate athletics in its institutional life. Many colleges and universities find this issue challenging, particularly those which, like CMU, compete at the NCAA Division I level. Division I status, and particularly Division I football, provides significant publicity and name association with prestigious public universities. Division I status also helps keep alumni and donors connected with the university. On the other hand, the expense of maintaining such status is quite large. For an institution like CMU that faces severe financial challenges, the question of continuing to expend money to maintain this level of athletic status inevitably arises. One must ask whether the cost is worth the benefit.

At CMU, there is no doubt that most student-athletes benefit from being able to compete in Division I sports. CMU does a commendable job of ensuring that athletes are getting a solid education, and this is reflected in the scholastic awards and the relatively high graduation rates for student-athletes. Furthermore, CMU’s athletic programs have done an outstanding job of running clean programs. There is also no question that our athletic programs have contributed significantly to CMU’s efforts to diversify our student body. Nonetheless, one must ask whether as many, or more students, would benefit if CMU competed in Division IAA in football or in Division II. Could CMU do a better job in diversifying its student body by reducing athletic scholarships in order to provide more academic scholarships to students from underrepresented groups? One implication of such a shift would be that CMU would no longer meet the qualifications for membership in the Mid American Conference, the athletic organization in which most of the institutions to which we are compared compete and of which CMU has been a member for over three decades.

It seems appropriate that such questions be adequately discussed during deliberations about budget reductions. An issue arose on campus during the last round of major cuts over the perceived protected status of the athletic program. One of the guidelines for making decisions about the reductions, based on CMU’s mission statements, was: “maintain

---

**Table 4-5. Expenditures by Function (in Millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Fiscal Year Ended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Capital</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4-6. Budget Reductions: 2002-03 and 2003-04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Area</th>
<th>Reduction Amount (In Millions)</th>
<th>Percentage of Division/Area Base Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–The Colleges</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Other academic areas</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administrative Services</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other includes auxiliary services and certain subsidized general fund activities; the percentage reductions varied and were partially offset by revenue increases by some units.
CMU’s ranking as a doctoral/research-intensive university with an NCAA Division IA athletics program. Although athletics could be cut (and did indeed suffer significant budget reductions), any reductions that would jeopardize CMU’s Division IA status were off the table. This seemed unfair. The issue was further aggravated by the fact that several expensive improvements in athletic fields and marketing campaigns had to be made during the time of budget difficulties (see Table 4-7).

The campuswide survey conducted by the Vision Planning Steering Committee confirmed that the campus community is split on this issue. Many faculty members believe that the Division IA status is beneficial for CMU, that it gives us the needed prestige of a “national” university, and that it is important for attracting students and for attracting donations to the university. They argue that athletic competition with more prestigious schools naturally leads to striving to be more like them in other areas, including academic standards and scholarship, and one must recognize that such competition requires budgets comparable to those of the other institutions. They further say that it is the responsibility of the administration to set such priorities.

Others disagree and argue that CMU’s significant investments in intercollegiate athletic programs are indicative of a misaligned sense of priorities. They feel that the millions of dollars from the general fund that subsidize athletic programs would be better spent to augment the financially strapped academic division. These campus members maintain that CMU would be better served by becoming Division IAA, Division II or even Division III, at least in the most expensive sports, or perhaps CMU should focus only on a few sports in which it can be competitive. They do not accept the Athletics argument that there would be little savings in going to Division IAA or II. Many were incensed that the athletic program apparently received a privileged status during budget cut negotiations, and felt this violated, at least in spirit, a sense of shared governance at CMU.

The university is completing its second cycle NCAA athletic certification self-study and it is anticipated that additional budget support may be necessary to retain its certification as a Division I institution. If this is true, it is certain that the controversy over this issue will continue.

**Human resources**

In the past eight years, the human resources employed at the university have remained fairly stable overall, with growth in regular faculty numbers offset by decreases in staff positions (most significantly in the office professional and service maintenance areas). This is shown in Table 4-8. Reductions were experienced across the campus, although the primary decreases were in administrative and support units. Those units have been challenged to better define essential services and outputs, retain their emphasis on those, and reduce or eliminate others. Non-academic services to students have also been affected. CMU is finding

**Table 4-7. Capital Improvements to Athletic Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Softball Field</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$413,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly/Shorts Stadium expansion &amp; Indoor Athletic Complex*</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$28,372,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Bennett Outdoor Track</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$1,103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theunissen Baseball Stadium</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$4,579,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football field turf replacement</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$663,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Field Hockey field**</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Also included some costs of relocating the recreational athletic fields.

** Funded from revenue from NCAA.
there is increased competition for quality students, good faculty, skilled administrators and staff with specialized skills.

A full discussion of CMU’s student-to-faculty ratio and how it has changed over time is given in Core Component 3B of Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching*. Here, it is relevant to point out that the on-campus student-to-faculty ratio (as FYES-to-FTE) averaged 21.8 over the past six years, although preliminary results for the current year show an increase above this average.

IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) data are collected from institutions nationwide and reported to the federal government. These data allow direct comparisons between institutions, and indicate that CMU is understaffed compared to comparable institutions. CMU’s student-to-faculty ratio using IPEDS, which counts students and faculty in somewhat different ways than CMU does internally, is 23 to 1. This places CMU last among its eleven benchmark institutions, as shown in Figure 4-7. Figure 4-8 shows that CMU’s student-to-staff ratio of 18.7 to 1 is the second highest ratio among its 11 benchmark institutions. Similarly, Figure 4-9 shows that CMU ranks at the bottom of its benchmarking group in library staff per student.

CMU’s efforts in optimizing its staff in order to deliver high levels of service have been made more difficult by the reductions in state funding. Clearly, additions of more staff are not generally possible, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-8. Filled Staff Positions as of February 1*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcount of Filled Positions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>as of February 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTR. SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (NON-STUDENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Groups listed in this table are defined according to CMU employee groups. They are not necessarily comparable to employment groups defined by external surveys.

**In 2004-05 Police Sergeants (4) moved from PO group to P&A group.
the university needs to continue to develop its efficiency of operation to make the best of this situation.

**Figure 4-7. Student-to-Faculty Ratios at Benchmark Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University-Oxford</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona State University</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These ratios are based on IPEDS data, and therefore are not exactly comparable with those on Figures 5-2 and 5-3, which use ratios based on internal definitions of FTE.

**Figure 4-8. Student FYES-to-Staff FTE Ratios at Benchmark Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania-Main Campus</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University-Oxford</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-9. Student to Library Staff Ratios at Benchmark Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>102.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>119.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td>138.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania-Main Campus</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University-Oxford</td>
<td>184.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>129.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>171.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The improvement in and adequacy of physical resources at CMU continues to be a positive. The expanded library, new health professions and music buildings are prime examples of facilities that strengthen the university’s educational quality. Three new residence halls opened in the fall of 2003, providing additional facilities to better serve students. Those halls were immediately filled with average occupancy very close to 100%. In addition, the university allocates approximately $3 million annually of the mandatory student technology fees to improve the university’s instructional equipment, student and administrative systems, and computer laboratory facilities.

The university also assesses its students a fee to provide funding for campus improvements to supplement its regularly allocated capital budget resources. For the 2004-05 fiscal year, the Board of Trustees allocated $3.25 million of the accumulated fees to undertake projects related to campus landscaping, facility construction/renovation projects and campus lighting replacement and upgrades.

**CMU has made concerted efforts to increase its revenue base and identify new sources of funds.**

CMU’s revenue profile has changed significantly since 1999 as shown in Figure 4-10. The proportion of revenue coming to CMU from state allocations has decreased, while revenues from tuition/fees and from departments and activities have both increased.

The revenue portion coming from departments and activities represent efforts that began well before the 2003-04 and 2004-05 reductions in state funding. CMU reviewed its funding sources, which led to plans to improve the return from existing sources and to seek new ones. The university was aware that its endowment was low for an institution of its type. Per-student funding was also low, and remained so despite attempts to improve allocations through government relations efforts. As a result, CMU has concentrated on improving its revenues in multiple ways; the recent drops in state funding have put increased pressure on these efforts.

**Endowment**

CMU’s Endowment Fund consists of true endowment funds and funds functioning as endowment. The principal of true endowment funds cannot legally be expended, while the principal of funds functioning as endowment may be expended. For investment purposes, the two types of funds are aggregated to the extent the funds’ terms permit in order to achieve better returns.

Figure 4-11 shows the market value of the university’s endowment at the end of each of the past ten fiscal years. Overall, the endowment has increased, even in spite of the serious downturn in the economy in the late 1990s.
Development

The university has made a major commitment to increasing its development and alumni relations activities in an effort to generate private support. The addition of a vice president to preside over a division dedicated to development and alumni relations has had a significant impact on growth in private support. This support is used to supplement existing operational funds. Besides a central development staff, individual development officers were assigned to the six academic colleges, the athletic department, libraries, public broadcasting, and the ProfEd unit. The five-year growth in gifts has been most impressive, as shown in Figure 4-12. Gifts for the year ending June 30, 2004 totaled $13,462,525, a 104% increase over an annual total of $6.6 million only five years ago.

In 2003, the university launched a $50 million capital campaign called “A New Vision of Excellence.” The results exceeded the $50 million goal in November 2004, generating new scholarship support for students and needed funds for critical facility projects. A specific breakdown of campaign fund areas and the amounts raised as of March 2005 are shown in Table 4-9.

Grants

The university has also made a concerted effort to increase the money received from external granting sources. Based on the ORSP’s annual reports of grant awards, CMU has successfully enhanced grant activity, as shown in Figure 4-13 which presents the eight-year history of the value of external grants received by CMU (excluding grants received directly from CMURC). There have been increases in both the number of submissions and in grants received (see Table 6-8 in Chapter 6, Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge). The trend in increasing grant monies demonstrates that the university is making positive strides in this effort.

Government relations efforts

CMU has expanded the scope of its government relations and lobbying efforts. CMU is now a significant participant in developing higher education policy at the state level. These efforts have also helped ensure that CMU receives appropriate consideration in the state’s operating and capital improvement appropriations. This is illustrated in Table 4-10, which shows recent funding proposals for Michigan’s 15 public universities by the Michigan state legislature. The recommendations for CMU compare favorably with those for the other schools.

In addition, a member of the government relations staff routinely spends time in Washington, D.C., developing relationships and assisting

---

19 vision.cmich.edu/index.htm
20 Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
21 www.orsp.cmich.edu/news.htm
22 Central Michigan University Research Corporation
23 Associated Press June 9, 2005
in obtaining federal research monies. One result from this effort was a special grant of over $2.5 million from the U.S. Army Research Laboratory for a dendritic nanotechnology center.

Table 4-10. Proposed State Appropriations for Michigan Institutions, June 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Current State Funding</th>
<th>Proposed House</th>
<th>Proposed House</th>
<th>Proposed Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>$79.3</td>
<td>$81.5</td>
<td>$80.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State University</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior State University</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>285.2</td>
<td>286.4</td>
<td>284.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley State University</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan — Ann Arbor</td>
<td>318.1</td>
<td>315.5</td>
<td>320.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan — Dearborn</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan — Flint</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>216.4</td>
<td>203.1</td>
<td>203.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 2B**

CMU is strong in this area but is in a vulnerable position. The institution has maintained good fiscal health during reductions in state appropriations, primarily because new sources of revenue have been cultivated. New revenue streams have resulted from investments made in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and in development and alumni relations as well as from improved governmental relations efforts. Nevertheless, CMU is working within a slim margin of its budget, putting it “on the edge” by spending close to what it takes in and dependent upon auxiliary enterprises such as its off-campus programs for revenue. If CMU is to make progress toward its vision, additional revenues will be needed. Also, any unexpected decreases in revenues in the near future will severely cut into CMU’s ability to fulfill mission goals at current levels.

**CORE COMPONENT 2C**

The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

An organization that seeks to improve its performance gathers data about its activities. Some of this information is generated in response to mandates from governmental or regulatory bodies, some information
results from special studies intended to cast light on particular issues, and other information arises from routine record-keeping. The key to bettering performance is to use available data to critically assess how to go about making improvements.

CMU is committed to ongoing evaluations to gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of university functions and, where warranted, to use results for improvement. Evaluation is essential for CMU given the university’s modest resource base. The following section discusses examples in which such analyses are focused on improving institutional effectiveness and how there is room for continued growth in this area.

EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

**CMU has processes for collecting, analyzing & using information**

**Institutional data analysis**

The Office of Institutional Research at CMU has a staff of five (4.1 FTE). This office works within the Office of the Provost and often in partnership with other offices on campus. For example, the Office of the Dean of Students works with institutional research staff to plan nonacademic and student service programs. Also, institutional research and student services offices periodically conduct surveys pertaining to student satisfaction and student characteristics such as the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey and the CIRP Freshman Survey.24

Data collected and monitored by this office provide insights into challenges facing CMU. As an example, CMU’s routine monitoring of retention rates25 revealed a precipitous drop in the one-year retention rate of the 1996 freshman cohort. To make the campus aware of this, the university began holding annual campuswide forums that brought faculty, staff, and students together with experts in the field of retention and graduation. In addition, the university created a program that funded opportunities for faculty and students to engage in educational activities outside of the classroom. The university also created a new policy that required undergraduate students to declare a major or sign an intent-to-major form by the time they have earned 56 hours; failure to do so resulted in suspension of student registration privileges. Subsequent to these efforts, retention rates returned to and exceeded previous retention levels.

**Academic program assessments**

The Academic Planning Council, the Assessment Council, and the Office for Curriculum and Assessment are critical to the evaluation and assessment of new and ongoing academic programs. These are discussed more fully in Core Component 3A of Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching.*

---

Enrollment management

The university has a workable operational approach to enrollment management. Annually, enrollment targets are established for the subsequent year and the university generates enrollment projections, which help determine budgeted tuition revenue for the next year. Some enrollment management tasks are forward-thinking, such as the president’s FY2002 strategic statement, the development and periodic updating of the campus capacity and optimal sizing model and a thorough evaluation of institutional scholarships by two separate ad hoc review committees in recent years. Nevertheless, although long-term enrollment goals are clearly expressed by the president, this forward thinking is not incorporated into an overall systematic approach to managing long-term enrollments. CMU needs to formalize a long-term enrollment management plan and has made the commitment to do so within CMU 2010.

Faculty information

In 2003, CMU was awarded a Title III grant to expand its academic information handling systems. One of the performance indicators is that there will be annual increases in the numbers of faculty whose curriculum vitae information is added to the Faculty Information Database (FID). To help assess progress toward this and other indicators, CMU licensed Crystal Reports 10 and Crystal Enterprise 10. These functions, known collectively as Crystal Enterprise, now allow business intelligence principles to be used in understanding and reporting faculty performance at CMU. Its use will be expanded to interface with other spreadsheet and database sources.

Title III staff now regularly create and refine FID reports that document faculty contributions to CMU’s progress toward goals. The FID reports contribute to CMU’s participation in two University of Delaware studies, one on instructional costs and one on faculty out-of-classroom activity, as well as for reporting requirements such as this self-study.

Space utilization

The university is committed to the efficient use of academic space. The university’s capital request submission to the state of Michigan demonstrates efficient use of existing resources. Annually the provost reports classroom and seat utilization rates to the Board of Trustees. Over the last five years, the university administration has encouraged

26 www.ires2.cmich.edu/Students/enrollment_profile_projection_2004.pdf
27 www.ires2.cmich.edu/comparative/campus_capacity.pdf
29 The Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity provides a comparative analysis of faculty teaching loads and direct instructional cost at the level of academic discipline. The Delaware Faculty Activity Study measures out-of-classroom faculty activity. Normative comparisons are created based on Carnegie classification, highest degree offered, and our set of “peer institutions” that participate. The information collected is shared with the Deans, Faculty Personnel Services and FaCIT. One example of its use was by the President who used the Psychology normative workload data when considering a request to reduce that area’s teaching loads.
colleges and departments to use the full week calendar by offering classes that meet during less popular times, such as on Fridays and at early morning hours. Also, to aid the management of departmental priorities of classrooms, the university purchased and implemented Ad Astra, a computer software system that allows the university to isolate departmental use and reassign rooms among departments when necessary.

**Teacher education programs**

The College of Education and Human Services (EHS) annually surveys recent graduates and their employers to gather feedback regarding program effectiveness. This process has resulted in the addition and modification of certain course requirements. Furthermore, EHS annually shares MTTC (Michigan Test for Teacher Certification) test scores with appropriate department chairs and deans, which has motivated curricular changes (e.g., the mathematics competency level and the Earth Science major requirements). Market feedback has driven other EHS initiatives: 1) Provisional Admission Program, where two-year college students are guided by EHS to ensure a smooth transition to CMU; 2) Alternate Route to Teacher Education for secondary and elementary education, approved by the state and linked to P-12 school needs and some specific charter schools; and 3) expansion of the Ed.D. program to cover niche areas with market demand.

**CMU conducts reviews of its operations and units**

CMU carries out reviews of its programs and units. In some cases there is a formal review cycle; in others this is done when needed. Some examples are the regular reviews of academic programs and ProfEd and the reviews conducted in the past decade of the effects of the reorganization of the academic division in 1996, of the Academic Senate, and of the new budgeting process.

CMU reviews its academic programs on a seven-year cycle. The academic program review process is discussed at length in Core Component 3A of Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching*. The process is under the general supervision of the Academic Planning Council (APC), an advisory body to the provost.

New activities and procedures are typically reviewed several years after implementation. Some incorporate a review process, but in many cases this is not addressed. This form of evaluation can be illustrated using the case of CMU’s revised budget model.

CMU restructured its budgeting process in 1998, implementing a modified responsibility center management (RCM) budgeting model. The original RCM plan called for periodic reviews of the “quality of service center performance” including the centers’ subunits. These reviews of the effectiveness and efficiency of service centers were delegated to a Budget Review Advisory Council (BRAC) and a review...
schedule established. For the three initial years, centers compiled reports and made presentations on their operations to BRAC. However, the review process failed to provide feedback for unit improvement nor did it result in any reallocation of resources. It was concluded the review process was ineffective and this portion of the new budget process was stopped. In 2004, a Budget Restructuring Review Committee (BRRC) was established and charged with evaluating CMU’s responsibility center management process, including the problems with service unit reviews.

As well as internally based reviews, CMU also makes use of external evaluators. Bringing consultants to campus to gather evidence, make an expert evaluation, and then provide constructive feedback is becoming common. Some recent examples of this approach which had significant value for the campus are:

- In 2004, an assessment of the project to develop an academic information system identified shortcomings in the planning and made recommendations for priorities in funding for the project.
- In 2004, a review of the Office of International Education identified needs for additional support and for more efficiency.
- In 2005, an evaluation of information technology operations found CMU has many strengths in this area but made recommendations for a number of changes.
- In 2005, a review of the campus’ facilities management operation identified opportunities for improved management.

In summary, CMU reviews its operations and units and meaningful insights are generally obtained. However, regularizing this has been difficult to achieve and there are concerns about follow-through after reviews. There has often been a lack of willingness to discontinue low-impact or inefficient academic and non-academic programs and services in order to reallocate resources to more critical and successful ones.

**CMU uses the data it collects to improve the institution**

The university collects lots of data and uses it to make adjustments, improvements and decisions. Several examples have been provided in the section above, and additional examples are described below. However, there is a general sense that in too many cases collected data are not used and/or shared between groups. Decisions are made without having all relevant information. Also, there is some duplication in data collection which leads to different and inconsistent data sets for the same topics. Part of the problem seems to be the lack of a centralized database and part the result of CMU’s lean staff situation. Often there is little time for staff to gather and evaluate any but the most critical information.

Some examples of how data are, or have been, used in making improvements include:
SAP implementation

The new campus information system, SAP-Campus Management, has brought the campus to realize the need for, and move to implement, several administrative improvements. Some that have been instituted are:

- integrated procedures for accounts that affect multiple campus operational units,
- online access to master course syllabi and curricular proposals, and
- online bulletins which simplify the process of keeping curriculum offerings current and consistent.

Staff evaluation and development

Human Resources has created a number of staff development programs as a result of needs and trends analyses. These include:

- a performance management program for senior-level staff and administrators;
- a comprehensive supervision training program;
- a process improvement workshop to help departments deal with budget reductions and fewer staff;
- the STARS (Specially Trained and Ready for Success) program to assist CMU employees in reaching their full potential in career and in life; and
- a service excellence program.

The last of these was in response to needs identified through a 2002 satisfaction survey. The survey is now an annual campuswide initiative. Human Resources monitors the results of the training programs it conducts. A return-on-investment analysis and behavioral change study was conducted on the department’s training efforts. The results can be downloaded from the Human Resources Web site.31

A cornerstone of the university’s commitment to evaluation and improvement lies within its management philosophy for employees and its dedication to goal setting, performance evaluation and reward attainment. A Pay for Performance program guides the university approach for senior officers and higher level professional and administrative employees. Under the program, employees and supervisors meet to establish an annual performance objectives and development plan, consistent with department, division and university goals. Semi-annually, supervisors and employees meet to review progress and update their plan, and at the end of the fiscal year, employees are evaluated on their overall performance. In most years, salary increases for these groups are intended to be based on employee performance.

31 www.hrs.cmich.edu/download-files/roi-pcd-feb03.pdf
Faculty evaluation and development

Faculty members are required to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness for promotion, tenure and reappointment. The university supports one means for doing so, the Student Opinion Survey (SOS), which is used by most faculty. SOS’s are administered in approximately 80% of the on-campus courses offered every term. Because this instrument is so widely used, CMU heavily relies on SOS results for evaluations of teaching effectiveness, although the use of multiple measures is strongly encouraged. Results from the SOS are routinely reviewed by deans and department chairs.

For off-campus courses, ProfEd has its own End of Course (EOC) surveys to gather student input regarding the course, facilities, technology and administrative services. ProfEd faculty and administrators use results to qualify faculty for reappointment and to evaluate the effectiveness of student services.

Research initiatives

For several years, grant applications and revenue did not meet goals established by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP). In response, the university enhanced its investment in internally available funds (seed money) designed to help faculty members start their research and therefore be able to write more competitive external grant proposals.

In the past three years, grant awards have increased from $9.4 million to $12.0 million, an approximate increase of 28%. During this same period, grant submissions and grants funded have increased 39% and 86% respectively. The President’s Research Investment Fund (PRIF) is credited with providing the impetus for this growth. President Rao created the fund in 2001 to expand intellectual and programmatic activities of the university by stimulating and supporting research and creative endeavors as well as faculty and student development programs.

Off-campus programs reorganization

CMU has successfully operated off-campus programs for over 30 years. Within the past ten years, CMU has experienced modest growth in some off-campus markets while shrinking in others, leading to an overall decline. Increasing costs, increasing competition for both students and faculty, and the relatively long time needed to initiate new programs have been cited as reasons for the observed decline. Dozens of competitors with faster-to-market times for in-demand programs have taken the lead CMU once held. Exacerbating the situation has been a lack of visibility and connection at CMU between the off-campus programs and on-campus units.

Attempts to address these changes initially involved cutting back services and staff rather than examining ways to more successfully compete in the market. However, the simple truth was that CMU’s off-campus operation was trying to operate on an outdated business model. Not only did this limit significant growth, but, if left to continue, this model would have prompted the demise of the organization. A
study initiated in 2003 analyzed how CMU should respond, which led to a complete restructuring of off-campus programs. A more complete description of the changes and their effects is discussed in Core Component 5A of Chapter 7, Engagement and Service.

Library

The ongoing on-campus enrollment increases in the late 1980s and early 1990s as well as changing trends in the ways in which students use libraries (e.g., computer and Internet use) made it clear that the campus needed a library that could address these needs. A decade of planning led to the construction of a new facility in 2002. As described earlier in this chapter, library use showed impressive growth after the new building opened (see Figure 4-1). However, this increase in use also portends areas of concern given recent budget reductions. These concerns include keeping the heavily used public workstations up-to-date, dealing with recent serials and acquisitions cuts, and maintaining service levels with reductions in staff/professional librarian positions.

Special needs

Student Disability Services (SDS) represents a unit that was established as a formal office in 1989, with origins extending back to the 1960s when a Disabilities Advisory Committee handled issues involving students with disabilities. In its first year, Student Disability Services provided academic and support services to 120 self-identified special needs students.

Since then, these services have evolved to match needs as determined from data gathered on students. In the 2004-2005 academic year, Student Disability Services provided services to 436 students with physical, psychiatric, and learning disabilities, and with attention deficit disorders. When the new library was constructed, plans were included to house the SDS office suite; an adaptive technology room was part of those plans, and it now allows students with special needs access to a distraction-free environment with specialized software and equipment including screen-readers, height-adjustable tables, a closed-circuit television (CCTV) for magnification of objects and printed material, a tactile image enhancer, and a Braille embosser available on special request for low-volume use.

These gains certainly allow CMU to respond well to special student needs. However, new burdens on SDS staff have developed as the result of budget cutting elsewhere on campus. A particularly troublesome side effect of budget cuts that eliminated the CMU Testing Center is the shifting of the accommodation of students who need special accommodations in test-taking. Whereas the Testing Center previously handled most of these needs, the staff in the SDS office are now taking over that responsibility. Last year, more than 500 student test-taking events were handled within the SDS office, many times involving staff relinquishing their offices for such. The SDS office previously handled
fewer than 100 such requests annually, and so this represents a huge increase in this type of activity without any increases in funding or space.

**Academic programs**

There are many examples of how evaluation and assessment results have led to the development of new academic programs and the improvement of existing ones. One example is the development by several units of capstone courses for senior students to culminate their learning experience. The efforts of the Honors Program to engage students in research and the creation of discipline-based residential colleges resulted from evaluation and assessment of needs. Campus surveys resulted in the successful *Raising Academic Standards* initiative; surveys were also used in identifying the areas to be cut during budget reductions.

**EVAULUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 2C**

The collection and use of evidence in decision-making is an area in which CMU has more concerns than it has strengths. We count as strengths the internal assessments that have led to improvements in off-campus programs, in the teacher education unit, and in initiatives designed to improve retention and to raise academic standards.

A large weakness in CMU’s efforts is the lack of good mechanisms for collecting and sharing data. At present, decisions are often made on insufficient or incomplete data. A major second deficiency is that, until this past year, CMU has not used formal long-term planning (e.g., strategic planning and enrollment management plans). This is only now being addressed through the *CMU 2010* initiative. A third concern is the lack of systematic evaluation for some initiatives.

**CORE COMPONENT 2D**

All levels of planning align with the organization’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

Planning is a key element in institutional improvement. Planning provides a systematic means for steering the institution's future toward improved effectiveness. In a complex organization, planning needs to occur at many levels. It is therefore crucial that planning be coordinated to avoid duplications of effort or conflicting goals between individual groups. Once goals and priorities have been agreed upon, they must not only drive planning, but must also drive budget allocations. An institution's true priorities are revealed through its budgeting choices.
EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

Planning at CMU is based on its mission documents

Since 2000, when Michael Rao assumed the presidency, there has been increased emphasis on strategic planning at CMU. The institutional mission and vision statements provide the guiding principles for planning, as these are the foundation for CMU’s institutional plan for 2005–2010, CMU 2010.

CMU 2010 identifies five institutional priorities along with the strategies for achieving those priorities. Furthermore, the document addresses how the various divisions and units will work to align their action plans with the institutional-level plan and identifies key performance indicators for measuring progress.

No later than April of each year, the president identifies specific goals in a memo to the board, which is also communicated to the campus through the president’s updates and his Web site. Divisions then use these to establish divisional goals by the end of May, with departments establishing their goals in June. Goals generally coinciding with the fiscal year are to be aligned to university goals. Unit goals and the status of their achievement are documented in periodic reporting to the president of the university who in turn annually reports that information to the Board of Trustees. Through CMU 2010 the university is addressing what has been a weakness — the lack of coordinated planning efforts across units.

Some examples of unit strategic planning efforts include diversity planning, the College of Business Administration strategic plan, the College of Health Professions strategic plan, and the strategic planning done by the Finance and Administrative Services division. In addition to the planning and goal setting by units, several critical planning efforts encompass units across campus. Examples are the planning undertaken by the Academic Planning Council, the University Community Advisory Panel, the Technology Planning Board, the Board of Trustees’ subcommittee on facilities planning, facility management’s oversight of the university’s deferred maintenance program, and the planning activities of the university’s development board.

Planning processes involve internal constituents and, where appropriate, external constituents

At CMU, the budget planning processes involve representatives from across all divisions of the university. This has been particularly true in
dealing with the budget reduction planning efforts for the 2003-04 and 2004-05 fiscal year budgets. Both BRAC and SSBAG were established with the goal of involving the appropriate constituents. Members of both groups provided broad representation of the campus community. Questions about the budgeting process raised by employee groups, students, and other campus members were addressed through open forums hosted by the president.

The university involves several external constituents in its planning processes. For example, CMU is a member of MUSIC (Michigan Universities Self-Insurance Corporation), a consortium of Michigan public universities developed to use cooperative planning for insurance coverage, loss control, and risk management services. Similar cooperative planning efforts are the outcome of the university’s membership in MUCH (Michigan University Coalition on Health) and MERIT (Michigan Educational Research Information Triad, Inc.). In addition, President Rao meets with several regional advisory boards made up of Michigan citizens interested in the university’s success. Membership in these boards is based upon geographical regions; input from each group provides the president with perspectives specific to the communities represented.

Many academic colleges and departments use advisory boards made up of a mix of CMU faculty, staff, students, and individuals from different industries. These boards function in fundraising, curriculum development, and student career preparation. Such advisory boards link faculty and students with potential employers and professional organizations. Example advisory boards are associated with the College of Business Administration, the Business Information Systems Department, and the College of Health Professions.

Planning efforts geared toward boosting research activity at CMU led to the creation of the Center for Applied Research & Technology (CART). CART represents a highly innovative partnership between CMU and the mid-Michigan business community. Opened in 2002 to be developed as a high-technology research and business “incubator” facility, the CART research facility serves to support technical innovation through a university-supported research and manufacturing partnership with a number of companies that have located technological facilities in the Mt. Pleasant SmartZone south of the CMU campus. The development of this important research and development cooperative conforms to the new entrepreneurial applied research focus of CMU. The Mt. Pleasant SmartZone initiative is a joint venture between the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, the City of Mt. Pleasant, and CMU.

40 www.cba.cmich.edu/viewbookcd/CBA_NAV/cba_bus_conn_programs2.htm
41 bis.cba.cmich.edu/advisory/
42 www.chp.cmich.edu/advisoryboard/profiles.htm
EVAULATION OF CORE COMPONENT 2D

CMU’s performance in this area is mixed. Planning of individual units is generally driven by the institutional mission documents, and so units are actively aligning their goals with institutional goals. However, until recently, the university lacked a larger, institutional planning process. This is now changing as a result of CMU 2010, which is based on the mission and vision. Regarding the implementation of planned initiatives, there have been difficulties in how to refocus resources, including making cuts, and making certain that the budget remains aligned with institutional priorities.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

STRENGTHS

1. **Budget**: Despite reduced state allocations, CMU remains fiscally sound as a result of careful planning and budgeting.

2. **Budget Responsiveness**: 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.

3. **Professional Growth**: CMU offers an extensive set of educational programs to support the growth and development of its faculty and staff.

4. **Development Efforts**: The investment in private fundraising efforts has produced significant increases in alumni relations activity and private support.

5. **Student Services**: CMU provides high levels of services to students in non-academic areas (e.g., residence life, registrar services, information technology services).

6. **Off-Campus Programs**: ProfEd programming has been reorganized to better address student and campus needs.

7. **Technology**: 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.

8. **Facilities**: 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.

9. **Government Relations**: CMU’s government relations efforts have increased and have made gains in protecting CMU’s interests and in securing funding.
CONCERNS

1. **Enrollment Management**: CMU needs a formal long-term enrollment management plan.

2. **Planning**: There has been a lack of formal centralized, comprehensive, long-term, and strategic planning efforts. In March 2005, the Board of Trustees approved *CMU 2010*, which should begin to meet the university’s needs in this area.

3. **Equipment Replacement**: CMU needs to have a plan and budget for regular replacement of equipment and instrumentation.

4. **New Initiatives**: CMU lacks a formal process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of new initiatives to ensure the appropriate allocation of fiscal resources.

5. **Program Elimination**: There has been a lack of willingness to, and the expectation that CMU will, discontinue low-impact academic and non-academic programs and services in order to reallocate resources to more critical and successful ones.

6. **Data Sharing**: Relevant institutional data are often not reviewed or available when making decisions, usually because of insufficient time, personnel and/or accessibility of the data.

7. **Budget**: While CMU remains fiscally sound, the loss of revenue and budget reductions have affected its ability to address institutional priorities. Operating costs new buildings have placed additional strain on the budget. 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.

8. **Competition**: 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.
CHAPTER 5
CRITERION 3

The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.
CRITERION THREE
The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

CMU, like many other public universities, is committed to making contributions in three fundamental areas: teaching, research, and public service. Of the three, CMU’s teaching mission has historically received the greatest emphasis. The university has consistently placed the highest priority on a student-centered campus environment, one that values strong teaching and productive learning. Teaching and learning still constitute the heart of CMU’s mission and vision for the future.

This chapter begins with aspects of CMU’s mission that relate to this criterion, and then discusses and evaluates CMU’s performance relative to the four core components. There are frequent references to CMU’s curricular process and assessment policies. As background, these are summarized in Appendix 5-1 and Appendix 5-2, respectively.

MISSION ELEMENTS
CMU’s mission statement begins with the university’s clear intent to center its efforts on teaching and learning:

Central Michigan University serves Michigan and the larger community as a doctoral/research-intensive university focused on excellent teaching and student-focused learning.

The phrase “excellent teaching and student-focused learning” shows that CMU takes stock both of what it puts into the process (teaching) and what it reaps as a result (student learning). An evaluation of both components is essential in order to ensure that learning goals are being met and that materials and methods are modified when necessary to keep pace with changing student and societal needs.

One of CMU’s core values makes the stronger statement that learning and teaching are the university’s most valued priorities:

Core value: Student-focused learning. Placing the strongest value on learning and teaching.

The commitment to teaching and learning is reaffirmed in CMU 2010 where it is identified as CMU’s top institutional priority.

CORE COMPONENT 3A
The organization’s goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

It is now widely recognized in higher education that establishing intended student learning outcomes and regularly assessing student

1  www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Appendix5-1.pdf
2  www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Appendix5-2.pdf
3  www.cmich.edu/mission-goals.htm
learning relative to those intended outcomes are essential for ensuring a quality academic program. CMU endorses this concept and states its commitment to offering quality academic programs in several sections of its mission documents. The words “quality” and “excellence” are used in reference to the high standards of performance that are expected from students, faculty, and staff. The following excerpt from our mission statement makes it clear that CMU will support assessment efforts in tracking how well standards are being met:

In all of its activities, Central Michigan University encourages the ongoing monitoring of quality and the achievement of excellence.

CMU has established a good foundation for an effective assessment program that is based on specified student learning outcomes for its Academic courses and programs. As a result of the financial and infrastructural investments made in the program, assessments are carried out at all levels — from the learning achieved within individual courses to assessments of the effectiveness of university-wide programs that contribute to students’ educational experiences. Assessment results prompt discussions between deans and department chairs, between chairs and their units, and among faculty and administrators. CMU increasingly applies data collected from assessments to matters pertaining to program review, planning and fiscal decision-making.

EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

Student learning outcomes have been established

CMU requires that student learning outcomes be formally articulated and approved for all courses and programs. As the guiding objectives for what faculty hope students will learn, these learning outcomes are the critical starting points for effective assessment.

Course learning objectives

Academic Senate policy mandates that all courses have expected learning objectives. These are specified within each course master syllabus, which must be approved through the appropriate curricular process. The official master course syllabi are held in the Academic Senate office and are available online to the CMU community.

Policies are in place calling for distinctions among courses of different levels. Undergraduate and graduate courses have separate expectations and curricular committees to oversee them; published information is made available to students in separate bulletins. When curricular changes are proposed, the appropriate curricular review bodies evaluate the course content, learning objectives, and instructional methods with respect to the course level as designated by course number.

4 personal2.cmich.edu/mcs/syllabi (need CMU global ID and password for access)
Program learning outcomes

The Policy on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment requires that all academic programs have assessment plans that include clear learning outcomes. This not only includes the standard on-campus undergraduate and graduate degree programs but also CMU’s few graduate certificate programs, all the degree programs offered off-campus and university-wide programs like general education. This requirement is reinforced by the Academic Planning Council through its expectation that new program design should begin with a set of student learning outcomes and that plans for assessment be developed when planning new programs. Assessment plans for existing programs must be updated at least every five years.

A list of the student learning outcomes for CMU’s academic programs sorted by college, department, and program are available online. The Assessment Council is responsible for the approval of student learning outcomes and assessment plans; the General Education and the Professional Education Assessment Councils are responsible for development of the plans for assessment of general education and the teacher preparation programs, respectively. The Office of Curriculum and Assessment keeps approved materials on file. The Assessment Council, and the Director for Curriculum and Assessment in particular, provide consultation and workshop opportunities to assist units developing or revising learning objectives.

An assessment plan must include:
- intended student learning outcomes from the program;
- curriculum map showing alignment of courses with learning outcomes;
- strategies and methods to be used for collecting evidence of student learning;
- plans for how findings will be used to improve the program.

Table 5-1 summarizes the distribution of academic programs with regard to the currency and approval status of their assessment plans at the end of the Fall 2004 semester.

Eighty-three percent of CMU programs have assessment plans on file, but only 36% are both current and approved. Twenty-six percent of plans are pending approval; the large backlog resulted from a large number of programs updating their plans in 2003-04, followed by a five-month vacancy in the position of the director for curriculum and assessment. Another 21% of programs have plans, but they are over five years old. The details of program assessment plan activity by programs are summarized in the assessment database report.

Most of CMU’s largest programs do in fact have up-to-date student learning outcomes. A review of the students graduating from CMU
during May, August, and December 2004 commencements showed that 82% graduated from programs with approved plans. An additional 13.5% graduated from programs in which the plans were pending approval. Therefore, in terms of student impact, 95% of these students graduated from programs with current learning outcomes.

Assessment plans, which include learning outcomes, are also required for university-wide courses and programs (e.g., First Year Experience, the honors program and the general education program). These have been developed and approved. A summary can be found on the Web site for the Office for Curriculum and Assessment.

Evaluation of academic program quality is comprehensive and ongoing and begins with established learning outcomes

Assessment of student learning takes place at the course, program and institutional levels. CMU is increasingly using assessment data in program improvement and in planning and fiscal decision-making, although the degree and quality of the assessment activities varies greatly.

A strength of CMU’s assessment policy is that it does not force conformity in assessment practice across academic programs, although the assessment policy does stipulate that, to be effective in measuring student learning, both direct and indirect assessment methods should be used. In fact, academic programs are requested to assess program learning objectives in multiple ways across a five-year period. The Assessment Council provides consultation to faculty and departments on effective strategies for assessment and funding to encourage the development of varying assessment methods.

Course assessment

At the course level, faculty regularly assess student performance in a manner consistent with methods outlined in a master course syllabus, which was developed by faculty of the appropriate department and approved through the curricular process. Examples of assessment

---

**Table 5-1. Status of Program-Level Assessment Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives and an assessment plan that is less than 5 years old</td>
<td>Approved: 108 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pending approval: 78 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment plan on file, that is over 5 years old</td>
<td>65 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assessment plan on file</td>
<td>41 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special cases*</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total academic programs required to have assessment plans</td>
<td>301 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes newly created programs, programs being phased out, programs not currently admitting students, programs significantly revised within the last year and special programs such as ROTC.

---
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instruments include papers, performances, projects, exams, case studies, portfolios, standardized tests, and student essays. In addition, many academic departments regularly survey their graduates, occasionally requesting their views about the effectiveness of individual courses. For more information, see the evaluation sections of the master course syllabi on file with the Academic Senate.\(^9\)

**Program assessment**

Academic programs are required to submit annual reports on their assessment activities and how information gleaned through assessment is being used. The format for the required annual reports can be seen on the Assessment Council Web site\(^10\). Compliance in annual report submission was a little over 50\% in 2003-04, and represents a continuing upward trend over the past ten years see Figure 5-1.) The decline in reports submitted in 2000-01 can be attributed to the changes that were underway within the Office for Curriculum and Assessment.

The lack of full participation in annual assessment is a concern for the campus. The motivation for many faculty to participate in assessment projects is mainly external; they comply because they are aware that the information is required by accreditation groups, or because the university has requested data for institutional reports. Many faculty have not yet moved to the point where they see program assessment as an integral part of teaching practice. The assessment activity level in individual departments seems to depend on one or more faculty members having an appreciation of the value of assessment. When such a faculty member does not exist, departments seem to have little assessment activity or it is very sporadic.

The faculty who are most engaged in assessment are those who have seen firsthand the value of systematic assessment in truly understanding what students are and are not learning. There are notable cases in which student assessment results have prompted significant curricular changes. For example, a number of departments, including history, sociology, and psychology, instituted additional research methods courses when student outcome data showed significant weaknesses in discipline-specific analytical skills. Similarly, a number of programs developed senior capstone experiences when it became clear that students needed such courses to be able to better integrate and apply their knowledge, and make the transition from college to career. Unfortunately there are also some programs that have identified desirable curricular changes through assessment but are reluctant to formalize those changes because they perceive CMU’s curricular approval process as too cumbersome.

**Program review\(^{11}\)**

The university undertakes periodic review of all academic programs. All majors, stand-alone minors, and graduate programs undergo review every seven years. Program review was revamped in 2003 to increase

---
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focus on ongoing program improvement through measurement of student learning outcomes and the use of external reviewers. There was also renewed commitment to providing timely feedback and constructive interactions at all stages of the process. The process further specifies that off-campus programs be included when associated on-campus programs are reviewed, consistent with the recommendation made by the Academic Senate’s most recent Board of Visitors\(^\text{12}\) that there be better connections between on-campus faculty and off-campus programs.

CMU’s Program Review follows a six-step sequence summarized in Table 5-2. The review begins with an “academic audit,” a somewhat unusual feature in academic program review. The audit verifies that master course syllabi and assessment plans are current and that required annual assessment reports are filed. Additional checks determine whether departments have structures in place that support quality programs (e.g., multiple measures of faculty teaching effectiveness as stipulated within department bylaws, assignment of key departmental responsibilities, and appropriate diversity of faculty and staff).

The review requires the department to conduct a self-study in response to specific criteria, some of which were adapted from the institutional accreditation criteria of the Higher Learning Commission. Programs that hold specialized accreditation may submit the self-study prepared for their discipline’s accrediting body instead of preparing a separate study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Brief Overview</th>
<th>Examples of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Audit</td>
<td>Departmental records and data, as well as institutional records (e.g., departmental data profile) are examined for evidence related to criteria</td>
<td>Master course syllabi on file; bylaws have been reviewed recently and include multiple measures of teaching effectiveness; current assessment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-study</td>
<td>Program faculty create self-study in response to criteria</td>
<td>Goals of department; CVs; student learning and other student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Review</td>
<td>External reviewer selected from list provided by department of academic leaders in same discipline, from similar or aspiration institutions</td>
<td>Self-study; interviews with faculty; interviews with graduating seniors; review of portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT Analysis and Ratings</td>
<td>Program summarizes its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and makes an overall summary rating of quality and funding</td>
<td>Audit, self-study, external review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Review</td>
<td>Responsible dean reviews all evidence and responds in writing, including ratings of quality and funding</td>
<td>Audit, self-study, SWOT, external review, ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Review and Recommendation</td>
<td>In conversation with program director (when applicable), department chair and dean (including graduate dean when applicable), provost comments on above materials, makes recommendations and group discusses plans for the future.</td>
<td>Audit, self-study, SWOT, external review, dean review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The inclusion of an external evaluator in program review was new for CMU, but has turned out to be one of the most valuable components of the process. External reviewers must be accomplished educators and scholars, preferably from comparable or aspirational institutions. The external reviewers are asked to provide an independent, discipline-based evaluation of the quality of the program in accordance with current practices and future directions in the field.

The results of the audit, self-study and report of the external reviewers serve as the basis for a “strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats” (SWOT) analysis carried out by the program faculty and then independently by the dean. The process culminates in a discussion among the program leadership, dean, and provost, where the focus is on the future of the program.

The first year of the new program review process was 2004-05. Table 5-3 summarizes the ratings that were given to the five programs for which their reviews were completed prior to the writing of this report. The programs received their ratings, along with recommendations for the future based on evidence and issues identified within their self studies. A number of the recommendations relate to needs for additional technical support, new programmatic initiatives and needs to better understand program quality, including student learning outcomes. Most recommendations came with a request for follow-up by a certain time by either by the dean, the chair or both. In all but one case there will be internal reallocations of funds within the college or institution, or new funds sought, to support at least one recommendation for each program.

Because the first year of the new program review process was in 2004-05, the Academic Planning Council established a subcommittee to review the effectiveness of this first round of reviews. For the next cycle, 2005-06, the following improvements have been made: timelines were adjusted; guidelines were expanded with examples of the kinds of evidence that should be included; instructions were elaborated to emphasize the need to use outcomes rather than inputs in analyses of quality; and more templates were developed (e.g., a standard contract for external reviewers).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Priority for Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Quality Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Licensing and certification testing

An important form of assessment for a subset of CMU programs has been students’ performance on certification and licensing exams given to new practitioners. Academic Affairs maintains records of specialized accreditations held by CMU and certification exams that are available to students graduating from CMU programs. These assessments provide CMU with standardized data regarding student performance that lend themselves to comparative, benchmarking functions. Validation of program content through these professional bodies and standardized examinations provides clear measures of program success in meeting external standards. Using pass rates as the criterion, there are a number of CMU programs which do well, including teacher education and health professions programs.

Graduates of Michigan’s teacher preparation programs must pass a certification exam in their field of specialization in order to become certified to teach. Overall, CMU students do well on the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) exams (see Table 5-4). For example, 91% of test takers passed the exam in 2002-03, which is slightly above the state average of 89.6%. The state provides CMU the MTTC exam results, which are circulated to the relevant academic departments and discussed by the Council of Deans and the Professional Education Assessment Council. Curricular changes are made as a result of campus analyses of the certification results as well as feedback received from the Michigan Department of Education’s periodic review of CMU’s education programs. For example, low pass rates on certification tests in earth science and social studies prompted major revisions in the teaching majors in those two areas.

Pass rates on licensure exams by graduates of health-related programs offered through The Herbert H. and Grace A. Dow College of Health Professions are also high. For example, graduates of the Physician Assistant program had pass rates of 100% (40 of 40) in 2003 and 93% (28 of 30) in 2004. Several of these programs are nationally ranked as reported in the 2006 U.S. News report on America’s Best Graduate Schools. Programs ranked in the top 30 nationwide include CMU’s Audiology (24th) and Physician Assistant (29th) programs. The Speech-Language Pathology (72nd) and Physical Therapy (74th) programs were also recognized as quality programs.

Specialized accreditation

Specialized accrediting organizations focus on the quality of programs, determining through analysis and site visits whether programs are responsive to changes in the field and needs of students. These groups maintain standards of practice and methods, and measure programs against those standards. Almost all look at the extent to
which institutions are preparing students in these specially accredited programs for life in a diverse, global, and technological world.

Specialized accreditation plays a key role in promoting quality for all of CMU’s K-12 professional education programs, as well as another 33 programs. About one-third of CMU students graduate from specially accredited programs. Notable recent re-accreditations are for CMU’s two largest programs, teacher education and business education by NCATE (2003) and AACSB (2005), respectively.

CMU encourages programs to seek, where applicable, specialized accreditation for several reasons. First, accreditation signifies that

Table 5-4. Percent Passing Michigan Test for Teacher Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Test in . . .</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts/Language Arts Elementary</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Earth Science</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (Secondary)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts/Technology</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Impaired</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Impaired</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (Elementary)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills—Reading</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills—Mathematics</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills—Writing</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results are reported only for tests taken by more than 10 students in 2004. Given how the Michigan Department of Education reports the scores, it is possible that scores for non-CMU graduates who happened to take the test at CMU are included in these results.
a program meets the quality standards of the field. Second, the expectations for periodic review assure that CMU stays focused on keeping current and maintaining high standards within those programs. Third, the visits by specialized accreditation teams allow the campus to interact with professionals and leaders in those fields and to seek advice on the opportunities and challenges faced by individual programs.

CMU’s social work program received first-time accreditation in 2004. The pursuit of ABET\textsuperscript{17} accreditation for CMU’s two new engineering degrees, along with accreditation of the art, interior design, computer science, and political science programs are underway. Once these are received, CMU will hold accreditation for all programs where special accreditation is available and considered important to CMU’s future.

**Supplementary review of off-campus programs**

Programs offered off-campus are subject to review beyond that normally required for their on-campus counterparts. For example, those offered outside Michigan are reviewed and monitored for quality by those states’ relevant agencies. All off-campus programs — both those in Michigan and in other states — are reviewed every five years by a “Board of Visitors” identified and charged by the Academic Senate. The most recent report called for more monitoring of programs by the on-campus faculty who developed and have responsibility for them.\textsuperscript{18}

**Teacher education programs**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) conducts periodic detailed reviews of all of the professional education programs. Such programs must adhere to a set of state-specified curricular standards, phrased as learning outcomes. MDE evaluates the program curricula and student outcomes relative to those standards based on institutional self studies. Those self studies can be seen on the College of Education and Human Services Web site.\textsuperscript{19} Generally speaking, the feedback on CMU’s programs is positive and there are usually opportunities for further improvement, which are undertaken by the institution.

**Departmental evaluation efforts**

Besides assessing the student learning outcomes of their academic programs, departments also study and evaluate other factors that can be important to learning. Typical information that is reviewed includes course enrollments, course grade distributions and withdrawals, graduation rates and placement data, pass rates on national examinations, and results from student and alumni surveys. One specific example is a recent analysis of grade distributions carried out by the physics department. When it was revealed that grading in laboratory courses lacked rigor and consistency, this department developed grading guidelines and worked with graduate assistants in applying them.
similar analysis led to major changes in the grading practices within the composition program.

**CMU provides significant financial support for assessment activities**

Assessment activities at CMU are administered by the combined efforts of four groups: the Office of Curriculum and Assessment, the Assessment Council, the Professional Education Assessment Committee and the General Education Council. The budget for assessment in Academic Affairs is about $135,500, which covers portions of the salaries of a director, office professional, and student worker, and workshops for faculty and staff development. The lion’s share of activity on program assessment goes on at the department and college levels, where costs for assessment are not broken out from other academic program costs. We do know that the College of Education and Human Services incurs significant costs associated with the assessment surrounding student teaching and interacting with the post graduate employers of graduates from CMU’s Professional Education Programs.

There are also resources to support individual faculty members and teams of faculty interested in bolstering their assessment programs. For example, funds for implementing program assessment activities, conference attendance, and professional development related to assessment are distributed by the Assessment Council — $20,000 annually. Colleges and departments also fund such activities.

**Assessment results are made available to appropriate constituencies**

CMU’s assessment policy mandates that assessment findings and their analysis “are to be made available to the Assessment Council, reviewing bodies, and to appropriate constituencies, including students.” Within faculty and administrative circles, assessment data are shared for discussions of quality, pedagogical approaches and possible curricular changes. For example, deans and department chairs regularly receive reports on assessment and results from departmental assessment activities. These are generally discussed at faculty meetings as well. Some units include results in newsletters to external groups.

Results from the assessment of general education have been widely available to the campus and reactions to them solicited. See the discussion of General Education in Core Component 4B in Chapter 6, Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge for the details.

Student access to assessment results is established as part of the assessment policy, but to date students have had limited access to assessment information. There are few established means to disseminate findings from assessment to students or to the public. Units are being
encouraged to post assessment results on their Web sites and sociology and physician assistant programs are good examples of programs that have done so. An initiative to address this shortcoming will begin in Fall 2005 as the result of CMU’s successful application to be part of a national study of the impact of higher education on student learning, sponsored by the Lumina Foundation. As part of the study, randomly selected first year and senior students will receive diagnostic feedback on their analytical, writing and critical thinking skills as indicated by their performance on innovative new performance-based tests. If students value this feedback and it is useful to the institution, CMU will look to expand this pilot to more students.

**CMU reviews the effectiveness of its assessment program**

Built into the *Policy on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment* is the responsibility of academic departments to “review assessment plans and activities periodically to ensure that they are leading to program improvement.” The Assessment Council is to “recommend to the Academic Senate a process for the comprehensive evaluation of the university’s assessment plan.” The policy further gives the director for curriculum and assessment responsibility for “periodically evaluating the overall effectiveness of assessment policies and practices and reporting them to the Assessment Council.”

In practice, the Assessment Council discusses the efficacy of assessment processes as meeting agendas permit. These discussions have led to six substantive revisions in the assessment policy itself in order to improve assessment practices. For example, the original aim that departments would be the primary users of assessment data was modified to stipulate wider dissemination of analyses of such data.

The Levels of Implementation tool developed by Cecelia Lopez when she was at the Higher Learning Commission has provided a useful tool for conveying expectations and prompting evaluative discussions. Last spring, the director for curriculum and assessment led a discussion with the Assessment Council, reviewing earlier studies and talking about areas of progress and challenge. About the same time, focused conversations regarding the status of assessment were conducted with the Professional Education Assessment Council and the department chairs. From the conversation with department chairs, it was decided to modify the approach to working with departments. The issues raised by the Professional Education Assessment Council surrounded their role in overseeing the efforts of the assessment of student learning as put forth in the professional education assessment plan and the relationship of that group to the Assessment Council. These roles have yet to be fully clarified.
CMU’s overall evaluation of its assessment efforts, based on the Higher Learning Commission’s “Fundamental Questions for Conversations on Student Learning,” can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission Questions</th>
<th>CMU Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How are your stated student learning outcomes appropriate to your mission, programs, and degrees? | • Outcomes are written as measurable, observable student-focused statements and are developed by the program’s faculty.  
• Learning outcomes are approved by curricular and assessment bodies, which review them for appropriateness regarding course level and degree program.  
• Outcomes are made public through the Assessment Web site and several departments post their assessment plans and annual reports. |
| What evidence do you have that students achieve your stated learning outcomes? | • Assessment plans and annual reports are filed which describe assessment activity.  
• Internal assessments as well as external measures (e.g. certification exams) provide measures of student learning.  
• Discoveries, conclusions and discussions of assessment results include both strengths and challenges. |
| In what ways do you analyze and use evidence of student learning? | • Program faculty choose the methods that will provide useful and appropriate assessments, including both qualitative and quantitative measures, and they evaluate the results.  
• Results are used by program faculty for self-evaluation purposes and are also used in the program review process to promote the continuous improvement of programs.  
• Assessment results are expected to stimulate discussions at all levels regarding curriculum enhancement, program change and pedagogy as a means to improve learning. |
| How do you ensure shared responsibility for assessment of student learning? | • The Academic Senate Policy on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment outlines the responsibilities of the various stakeholders, and describes the need for and encourages collaborative efforts.  
• In addition to faculty and students, a number of university committees have responsibilities in learning outcomes assessment activities. |
| How do you evaluate and improve the effectiveness of your efforts to assess and improve student learning? | • The charge of the Assessment Council and the Office for Curriculum and Assessment is to ensure conversations about program assessment and improving student learning remain central to faculty at the program, department and college-level as well as keeping the Academic Senate, provost, and president informed about these matters.  
• The Assessment Council and other key committees conduct periodic reviews of assessment results and assessment processes and recommend appropriate changes in policy or procedures. |

**CMU is aware of the challenges caused by its complex academic program structure**

A practical difficulty for CMU as we seek to manage assessment, program review and most other aspects related to academic programs is the complexity of CMU’s curricular structure (i.e., the degree and major requirements). CMU offers over 5,500 courses. These are organized into academic programs organized around a number of degree options — 13 bachelor’s degrees, 8 master’s degrees, 2 specialist’s degrees and 5 doctoral degrees — along with 20 graduate certificates. Defining precisely what constitutes an academic program, particularly at the undergraduate level, is confusing.

A typical student graduates with a major and a minor along with courses in the general education program. However, a major may be pursued under several degree options, each of which may have different degree
requirements. There may be differences within the major or minor for the different degree options, especially for non-teaching degrees as contrasted to degrees leading to teacher certification. Some majors have several concentrations. Further confusion results from the different definitions of program in the reporting requirements for federal and state government units.

An example of this complexity is illustrated in Table 5-5. It shows the 19 different undergraduate programs offered through the Department of Biology (not to mention the two interdisciplinary programs in which the department participates). However, the major requirements are the same for those options shown on a single row, and the minor is essentially a subset of courses in the major. Thus, for purposes of learning objectives and assessment, there are considered to be only eight programs, sometimes denoted as “specialized areas of study.”

While students may benefit from the many curricular options, the complexity presents significant challenges to implementing and monitoring assessment activities, for advising and graduation audits, for tracking curricular changes, and for other curricular matters. There are even questions about whether it will be possible to fully implement an automated degree audit system within CMU’s new student information system, SAP-CM, because of the complexity of CMU’s undergraduate academic programs. This would be a significant reduction in functionality for students and their advisors, with clear workload implications for faculty and staff advisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors and Minors</th>
<th>Non-Teaching/ or Teaching Focus</th>
<th>Major/Minor Options</th>
<th>Degree Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Biology Major</td>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td>General Option</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pre-graduate/Pre-professional Option</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Microscopy Option</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Natural Resources Option</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Teaching Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Biomedical Sciences Major</td>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Biology/Medical Technology Major</td>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Minor</td>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td>Teaching Secondary</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVAULUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 3A

CMU has effectively channeled resources to lay the groundwork for a successful program for assessing student learning. A strong assessment policy is in place. Longstanding policies of the Academic Senate require intended learning outcomes to be established, approved and assessed at the course and program level. Moreover, plans for assessing outcomes are endorsed by various senate committees as part of master course syllabi, new program, and assessment planning approval processes. More than half of our programs maintain compliance with the fairly ambitious requirements for assessment laid out in the Academic Senate's policies.

Faculty are wrestling with a complex curricular structure as they articulate learning outcomes and carry out assessment of their programs. A full-time director of curriculum and assessment in collaboration with faculty-led assessment committees oversees an ongoing assessment program that is still maturing. Not all programs have up-to-date assessment plans or file annual reports as required by the Academic Senate Assessment Policy. Although there are exceptions, data are not widely shared among all stakeholders, particularly students, and assessment results are not used to the extent that they could be for program improvement. An additional factor that limits progress in response to assessment is CMU’s curricular change approval process, which is perceived to be slow and cumbersome, and so discourages some faculty from responding to assessment findings with curricular changes that could improve programs.

The program review process, revised to address weaknesses that were present in the previous review system, uses student learning outcomes assessments to drive program improvements and to better integrate reporting of assessment data. As a group, programs reviewed in this initial year were seen as strong programs, although specific needs for improvement were identified.

The results of all of these evaluative reviews — curricular, assessment, and program — yield results largely validating the basic quality of academic programs; at the same time, they suggest areas for improvements. Progress in making those improvements is uneven, depending on a host of factors. The program review process is intended to bring analysis of some of these factors together as the future of the program is considered. The fact that program reviews are culminating in joint problem solving and reallocation or pursuit of new resources is promising.
CORE COMPONENT 3B
The organization values and supports effective teaching.

Central Michigan University has traditionally placed its highest priority on teaching excellence. The mission statement commits CMU to being a “university focused on excellent teaching and student-focused learning” and the first of CMU’s core values is “Placing the strongest value on learning and teaching.” The strength of this value has been great enough to maintain it as a priority throughout decades of growth and change. CMU 2010 again reaffirmed teaching and learning as the institution’s top priority.

Nevertheless, conditions exist institution-wide that create challenges to realizing this value. These are noted in this section, and further discussions of the challenges mentioned are taken up in Chapter 8, Special Emphasis. Here we show that the faculty are the authoritative group responsible for curricular decisions. Evidence is provided that demonstrates the high quality of faculty teaching at CMU, which leads into discussion of conditions that challenge faculty in maintaining their teaching effectiveness. Throughout the section are the numerous initiatives the university has undertaken to support faculty as teachers.

EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

Faculty determine the curricula for all CMU academic programs

At CMU, the primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum resides with its faculty. This puts both the authority and responsibility for curriculum decisions in the hands of the group best qualified to determine both course content and strategies for teaching and discerning whether students are achieving the intended learning outcomes. Development, change and assessment of curricula are centralized and governed by the Curricular Authority Document (CAD) of the Academic Senate. Refer to Appendix 5-1 for a detailed discussion of curricular processes.

CMU classrooms are staffed by faculty with expertise in teaching and their disciplines

CMU prides itself on maintaining a faculty with expertise in their academic disciplines. Ninety-one percent of on-campus tenured and tenure-track teaching faculty hold terminal degrees in their respective fields. Twenty-seven percent of temporary faculty hold terminal degrees. Research and scholarship are increasingly important at CMU. It is generally recognized that continued scholarship and professional activity are essential to maintaining teaching competence. Nevertheless, there is concern that the increased research expectations may impact the quality teaching as discussed in detail in Chapter 8, Special Emphasis.

21 http://academicsenate.cmich.edu/Cad/Curricular_Authority_Document.pdf
22 www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/Appendix5-1.pdf
CMU’s faculty demonstrate effectiveness in their teaching. A five-year series of surveys of CMU student opinions found that more than 90 percent of undergraduates were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the quality of instruction.\textsuperscript{23} Effectiveness is further demonstrated by the mean teaching effectiveness scores as reported in CMU’s Student Opinion Survey administered at the conclusion of courses. Mean values are consistently above the midpoint of the scale, indicating that students view teaching effectiveness to be high.

The value CMU places on effective teaching is also made clear through the university’s hiring, reappointment, and tenure practices. For tenure-track faculty, advertisements of faculty positions convey CMU’s priority to hire those who demonstrate promising teaching qualities.\textsuperscript{24} Part of a candidate’s interview consists of a formal presentation that is used to judge teaching promise. Those hired must demonstrate teaching effectiveness for reappointment and achievement of tenure. For temporary faculty, the On-Campus Temporary Faculty Policy\textsuperscript{25} makes it clear that individuals are hired primarily for their ability to teach. All faculty who teach only off-campus must be approved by the corresponding on-campus academic department. It has been a challenge to find individuals with expertise in their discipline, who are practicing professionals, who are effective in teaching nontraditional students, and who also meet university faculty scholarship standards.

All new faculty, teaching in on- and off-campus programs, go through an intensive workshop focused on helping them to be better teachers and which conveys the priority given to teaching and learning.

CMU’s commitment to excellence in the teaching of its students is also reflected in the restrictions on graduate student instruction. As stipulated in the general education policy,\textsuperscript{26} graduate students may not teach regular courses in the University Program portion of the general education program, unless they are advanced doctoral students. Other graduate students are permitted to teach only laboratory sections and competency courses.

\textit{CMU recognizes its challenges in maintaining high quality teaching}

Competing demands for faculty time, increasing expectations for scholarship and enrollment increases individually and collectively challenge CMU’s ability to sustain quality teaching.

\textbf{Role overload}

Faculty are increasingly encouraged to maintain high quality teaching as well as to pursue grant writing, scholarship, assessment, advising, student research, technology initiatives, and committee work. The

\textsuperscript{23} www.chsbs.cmich.edu/carrs/REPORTS.HTM  
\textsuperscript{24} wwwfps.cmich.edu/jobs/  
\textsuperscript{25} wwwfps.cmich.edu/documents/temppol.pdf  
\textsuperscript{26} academicsenate.cmich.edu/Policy/UP_basic_documents_set.pdf
Strains of role overload are further discussed in Chapter 8, *Special Emphasis*.

**Student enrollment increases**

As shown in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, CMU has experienced substantial increases in undergraduate student enrollments — a 23% increase since 1996-97. This has meant that CMU needed to increase its faculty numbers to maintain its student-to-faculty ratio. Figure 5-2 shows the total number of faculty FTE, along with the relative proportion of regular and temporary faculty over the past six years. Figure 5-3 shows the student-to-faculty ratio for the same period, first the regular faculty (tenure and tenure-track) faculty and then for the total faculty. Graduate student FTE has been excluded. The graphs reveal that faculty FTE has managed to keep pace with the enrollment increases, which amounted to 14% over this six-year period. The preliminary data for 2004-05, however, suggest that student-to-faculty ratio may be starting to creep upward.

Of further concern is the fact that CMU's student-to-faculty ratio is significantly larger than any of its 11 benchmark institutions. Figure 5-4 presents those ratios. Additionally, as would be expected, growth in enrollment has been uneven and some departments with popular programs have also found it difficult to staff sufficient sections to meet student demand.

---

Figure 5-2. Regular and Temporary On-Campus Faculty FTE

Figure 5-3. On-Campus Student-to-Faculty Ratios

---

27 Data on which the graph is based is at www.ires2.cmich.edu/comparative/benchmark2002.pdf
Figure 5-4. Student-to-Faculty Ratios at Benchmark Institutions
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Note: These ratios are based on IPEDS data, and therefore are not exactly comparable with those of Figure 5-3, which uses ratios based on internal definitions of FTE.

**CMU offers professional development to support effective teaching**

**Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching (FaCIT)**

CMU recognizes that investing in professional development will strengthen learning and sustain its faculty resource over the long term. Substantial professional development activity has been an attribute of CMU over the past two decades; however, in 2001, the Faculty Center for Academic Excellence was created to reinforce and extend that effort further. An Academic Senate committee exists to advise the center.28

In 2002, the Learning Technologies Group was formed as an in-house technology consulting service for faculty. Specifically, this group offered faculty access to expertise in video, audio, computer graphics, animation, and computer-interfaced educational software use.

In 2004, the Faculty Center for Academic Excellence merged with the Learning Technologies Group to form the Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching, or FaCIT.29 This merger achieved significant cost savings and provides more comprehensive assistance for faculty as they concentrate on improving pedagogies and incorporating technology when and where it best contributes to teaching and learning goals. FaCIT has eight staff members, including a director who is a national leader in professional development for faculty.

FaCIT offers university-wide workshops, customized departmental sessions, and individual consultations. It coordinates and supports faculty development opportunities in collaboration with many entities on campus: colleges, departments, offices, and centers. All new faculty members are introduced to FaCIT and its services during the two

---

28 academicsenate.cmich.edu/Committees/Faculty_Center_for_Academic_Excellence_Council.pdf
29 facit.cmich.edu/
days of teaching and learning workshops that are part of new faculty orientation.³⁰

There have been close to 2,500 attendees over the past three years in FaCIT workshops. FaCIT also assists approximately 75 faculty and staff per week on issues related to teaching and learning, totaling approximately 3,000 contacts per year.

In an effort to reach even more faculty and to provide resources in an “on-demand” format for anytime/anywhere development, resources and services are available through the FaCIT Web site.³¹ It provides, for instance, ready links to teaching tips, library resources, funding opportunities, and the university’s calendar of faculty development events. In the first six months of operation, there were 3,219 unique visitors, an average of 17 new users per day logging on to this Web site.

CMU also has a monthly newsletter, On Target,³² developed in FaCIT, which is electronically delivered to all on-campus faculty and approximately 1,400 individuals off campus, many of whom teach for ProfEd.

FaCIT provides support for Blackboard, CMU’s course management software package, for both on- and off-campus classes. Coordinating both a service response team and an executive council for CMU’s course management system, FaCIT brings ProfEd faculty and on-campus faculty together for both service and decision-making with respect to student learning.³³

The Multicultural Education Center

This unit provides training, resources, and support to faculty to increase the multicultural content of their courses and programs, and to facilitate diversity efforts more broadly. Its workshops are oriented toward building an inclusive and respectful community at CMU.³⁴ Its luncheon series, Soup and Substance, brings together faculty, staff and students from across campus to explore a wide variety of diversity topics and to hear from national experts.

Other workshops and resources

The annual New Faculty Orientation for both regular faculty and those with temporary appointments, full- and part-time, focuses specifically on effective teaching and scholarship, emphasizing what faculty need to know in their first few months on campus and modeling the active learning strategies we hope will increasingly characterize CMU classrooms. It includes both online and two days of face-to-face interactive workshops.³⁵ Beginning in Fall 2005, a DVD will be

³⁰ www.provost.cmich.edu/orientation/orientation.htm
³¹ www.facit.cmich.edu/
³² facit.cmich.edu/on-target/
³³ www.cel.cmich.edu/nontrad/
³⁴ www.diversity.cmich.edu/mec/WORKSHOP1.htm
³⁵ www.provost.cmich.edu/orientation/
provided that orients new faculty to CMU and stresses the university’s commitment to effective teaching.

CMU has received national attention for its work with off-campus adjunct faculty, with its current efforts supported through the Department of Education’s FIPSE Program. Those efforts focus on the assessment, development and mentoring of off-campus faculty, and the national dissemination of those practices. Resources and programs developed through this grant are also benefiting on-campus faculty through the Internet.

ProfEd developed pilot learning communities that link regular on-campus faculty with the part-time faculty who teach off-campus. It has prepared a document, *Articulation of the Faculty Role: Maximizing Learning*, for all off-campus faculty to emphasize shared responsibility for learning and high academic standards. A similar document targeting on-campus students, faculty and staff was developed in conjunction with our priority to raise academic standards as discussed below in Core Component 4C.

CMU also plays an integral role in regional faculty development by organizing a Lilly teaching and learning conference each fall that draws approximately 200 faculty from the Great Lakes region. This conference has become a premiere conference in teaching and learning with a national reputation for its quality.

**Individualized consultation**

Faculty may request individual consultations regarding teaching matters, which may include visits to classrooms, structured observations, feedback from students, and expert advice on improving pedagogy. Instructional design specialists are also available to assist in the creation of innovative course modules or to work on specific aspects of teaching that faculty find problematic.

CMU also sponsors a Web-based system designed for improving teaching through the *Individualized Form for the Improvement of Instruction* (IDF-II). Individual faculty may request administration of this standardized instrument, the results of which they use in a formative way to improve their teaching.

**Funding support for faculty professional development**

CMU invests significant amounts to support faculty development, as shown in Figures 5-5 and 5-6. However, these efforts are being compromised as the results of state appropriation cuts and callbacks. General fund allocations for centralized faculty development efforts were reduced by 27% between 2002 and 2005 (see Figure 5-5). A significant reorganization and prioritizing of services has been achieved, along with some federal funding, but it has not been possible to sustain the same level of service. Workshop offerings have become more limited.
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36 [www.cel.cmich.edu/faculty/docs/FIPSE-grant.pdf](http://www.cel.cmich.edu/faculty/docs/FIPSE-grant.pdf)
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and there are more faculty members interested in attending workshops than there are spaces to accommodate them. Although no positions were cut, reductions in FTE in the unit that provides professional development supporting diversity objectives were made.

Internal grants administered through the office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) and FaCIT for faculty travel, professional development, and research have also been reduced significantly, as shown in Figure 5-6. Particularly hard hit were the grants to support teaching and learning. These were reduced from $75,000 to $10,000, an 87% decrease.

The academic colleges also provide some support for faculty development. Each college handles this funding differently. This support has also been negatively impacted by budget reductions. Cutbacks have meant reduced funding for such activities as faculty attendance at conferences, which allows faculty members to keep current in their fields, present their scholarly work, and learn about teaching innovations.

One of the five goals of CMU’s ongoing $50 million capital campaign is a $4 million endowment for faculty development. While that goal has not yet been achieved, progress is being made, and there are now more private funds supporting faculty development than ever before.

**CMU offers technical and library support services that support effective teaching**

**Mediated technology support for improved pedagogies**

As part of the Learning Initiative for the Class of 2002, CMU mediated classrooms across the campus and is now a national leader in this regard. This is described in detail under Component 3D of this chapter. CMU also maintains an inventory of ten student-response system classroom kits that are available on a semester basis to faculty. Reservations and training are available through FaCIT. To date, 20 CMU faculty have made regular use of this technology in their courses.

**Library support services**

Each academic department is assigned a bibliographer who, in addition to being responsible for collection development, is available to faculty to assist with bibliographic instruction either within the “traditional” classroom or in one of the mediated classrooms housed in the renovated Park Library. Most of these librarians are members of the faculty and typically hold a second master’s degree in a discipline in addition to their library science graduate degree. Librarians are also available to students seeking consultation on classroom assignments and to faculty in the design of pedagogy involving information literacy skills. CMU’s Off-campus Library Services (OCLS) are extremely well developed; this unit is nationally recognized for its services in support of off-campus students and faculty. In a recent OCLS survey, over 90% of the students
surveyed responded that they were satisfied with OCLS’s document delivery services, which is one of its key functions for off-campus students.

**CMU is open to innovative practices that enhance learning**

**Web-based learning**

An area of substantial innovation has involved the recasting of existing courses into versions delivered through Internet technology. ProfEd, in conjunction with FaCIT, provides support staff who work with faculty in transferring materials from a traditional classroom format to one that effectively uses an Internet-based delivery system. The Curricular Authority Document specifies an approval process that is required when courses are so transformed.40

Some degree programs have substantial on-line components. Examples are the doctoral programs in audiology and health administration and a pilot program for the undergraduate business degree. CMU has emerged as a national leader in providing coursework for audiologists. The health administration program uses Internet technology to bring together students and faculty from multiple locations into seminar groups. The Bachelor of Science in Business Administration is the first large undergraduate degree program at CMU that has been approved by the Academic Senate for online delivery.

Web-based study at CMU goes beyond traditional credit-bearing courses. ProfEd developed Lesson Zero courses41 that allow students to learn about specific areas prior to committing to a program of study. These are especially appropriate for the adult learner. Also, in partnership with MindLeaders,42 CMU provides high quality online skills development courses that cover topics such as desktop computing, access to Windows 2000, and HTML programming.

**Technology as a driver of innovative teaching**

CMU’s two newest academic buildings — the Park Library and the Health Professions Building — were designed to incorporate cutting edge technology into learning functions. The Park Library contains over 350 public workstations and is wired with 2,000 Internet connections. The Health Professions Building was featured in the February 2004 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* for its advanced use of technology in learning and research. Concurrent with the opening of this building, several faculty known for their leadership skills in the use of technology were designated as Faculty Champions. They have developed innovative teaching practices that have been shared among all faculty using the new setting.43
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40 academicsenate.cmich.edu/Cad/Curricular_Authority_Document.pdf
41 www.ddlcampus.cmich.edu/lessonzero/default.htm
42 www.cel.cmich.edu/4educators/mindleaders.html
43 www.facit.cmich.edu/major-initiatives/champions.html
Learning environments are enhanced by the availability of Blackboard, the course management software package used by CMU instructors and students. FaCIT and ProfEd provide faculty training in its use. One component, the virtual laboratory, whether linked to Blackboard or used as a stand-alone function, is worthy of note because CMU faculty have used it to enhance pedagogical applications in fields as diverse as biology, fashion design, and industrial technology.

**Experiential learning**

Experiential learning offers innovative educational experiences for large numbers of CMU students. Internships, practicums, student teaching and service learning opportunities allow students to move beyond traditional classroom borders. A number of offices, including Career Services, coordinate internship opportunities. FaCIT houses a part-time faculty member who provides resources in support of service learning. The Volunteer Center, which reports to the Office of Student Life, provides Web-based lists of community volunteer opportunities to those students who wish to volunteer or who have course assignments that can be enhanced through volunteerism. Study abroad opportunities expand student horizons as well and can be incorporated as part of the general education program or as part of many majors.

As shown in Figure 5-7, CMU students’ reports in response to the NSSE survey indicate the extent of involvement of CMU students in these experiential learning opportunities. More than 70% of seniors participating in the survey had or expected to take an internship. Volunteering efforts were equally as high. Over the four-year period CMU has been administering NSSE, distinct increases in research, volunteerism and capstone experiences have been reported by students. On the other hand, the number of students involved in research, study abroad and capstone participation is still rather low relative to where CMU would like to be.

**Research and creative activity**

The increasing numbers of students participating in research signify faculty recognition of the value of providing discovery-based learning environments. A campus survey carried out as part of the development of CMU 2010 in Fall 2004 found engagement of students in research to be important at CMU. Most saw the main rationale for CMU’s increased emphasis on research and creative activity to be the enhancement of student learning.

Currently, student research is significant at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Three indicators of the extent of student research activity are listed below:
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44 www.careers.cmich.edu/Students/student.htm
45 www.stulife.cmich.edu/volunteer/career_opps.shtml
46 www.oie.cmich.edu/studyabroad/sa_programs.asp
47 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/SurveyFindings/SurveySummaryAllCampusNov.pdf
The Student Research and Creative Endeavor Exhibition (SRCEE)\(^4\): This annual event developed to publicize and highlight student research typically involves over 500 undergraduate and graduate students (see Table 5-6). In this one-day poster session and exhibition, students present the results of their projects, which were developed under faculty supervision.

- Posters at the Capitol: The College of Science and Technology annually coordinates a display of CMU student research projects at the Michigan State Capitol, where the students have the chance to interact one-on-one with legislators and their staff. The most recent event involved 52 students presenting 37 posters.

- Papers and professional presentations: Students are authors or co-authors on papers and presentations at professional meetings. Between 2000 and 2005, faculty reported 295 student co-authors on their papers and presentations (see Table 5-7). Over 40% of the students were undergraduates. A significant number of projects culminate in local and national presentations.

Some student research has led to external recognition. For example, the 2004 Greg Mellen Memorial Cryptology Prize was awarded to mathematics graduate student Lisa Driskell for work she completed during her undergraduate studies at CMU. Graduate student Simeon Stoyanov received a first place award in the Frank Smith Solo Competition portion of the International Trombone Festival in July 2004. Undergraduate Deidre Hunter was honored for her undergraduate research in geology with an invitation to participate in the site selection process for one of the 2004 Mars rover missions.

Although student research activity is significant at CMU, there is interest in increasing the amount of undergraduate student research and creative artistic activity. Figure 5-8 shows that CMU undergraduates participate in research at a level comparable to that of other institutions,
so increases would move CMU ahead of the norm. *CMU 2010*, lays out a strategy for increasing student involvement by providing more support for materials, summer stipends, and travel expenses for students to present at national conferences. This alone, however, will not be sufficient to make substantial gains. One obstacle that must be overcome, particularly in the departments that offer doctoral degrees, is the faculty workload issue. As addressed in Chapter 8, *Special Emphasis*, many faculty feel that other responsibilities limit their ability to engage in scholarship and to involve students in that scholarship.

**CMU regularly evaluates teaching**

Ongoing evaluation of faculty teaching is built into CMU policy. The agreement between CMU and the Faculty Association (the bargaining unit for CMU’s regular faculty members) requires that teaching be a key factor in all personnel decisions (*Agreement* Article 14, paragraph 2).

Further, it suggests that multiple measures of teaching effectiveness be used. All but one department allow for multiple measures, but only one department so requires their use in its bylaws. The deans and provost have asked departments to consider modifying bylaws to require use of multiple, sound measures of teaching effectiveness.

The agreement further gives authority to individual department bylaws in establishing many of the specifics surrounding summative evaluation of teaching effectiveness. All bylaws recognize teaching effectiveness as a key component of reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. Bylaws also spell out the criteria and standards necessary for successful personnel outcomes.

The policies and practice surrounding evaluation of temporary faculty are not as well established as those for tenured and tenure-tract faculty. In 2005, CMU formalized expectations for reappointment of temporary faculty to include satisfactory teaching. Off-campus faculty (most of whom also are not part of the bargaining unit) are reviewed by the appropriate on-campus departments on a three-year cycle, with the demonstration of teaching effectiveness necessary for subsequent appointments.

An end-of-course survey of students has been standard practice at CMU. On-campus this is the Student Opinion Survey (SOS). The Office of Institutional Research distributes the forms, analyzes the data, and makes summary reports available to faculty and personnel decision-makers through a user-friendly Web site. Despite a revision in 2003, there is ongoing dissatisfaction with how the SOS is used, which emerged most recently in a survey conducted in development of *CMU 2010*. Generally, some faculty feel the SOS is over-used in personnel evaluations, substituting for other evidence that would be more informative.

50  www.fps.cmich.edu/documents/tepd.pdf
51  www.ires2.cmich.edu/sos.htm
ProfEd provides similar student evaluative data to faculty, with an instrument designed to be especially appropriate for the adult learner. Specialized programs such as the Honors Program and the First Year Experience have also designed mechanisms for eliciting targeted feedback from their students that faculty can use when teaching such courses and reviewing the overall quality of the program.

**CMU recognizes teaching excellence**

The university recognizes excellence in teaching through several award programs. Five faculty are honored each year by a CMU Excellence in Teaching Award. CMU also regularly nominates faculty for national teaching awards, including most recently three faculty nominated for the Council for the Advancement of Secondary Education Awards and one faculty member who was nominated and then received the Innovative Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Technology award. CMU colleges also honor members of their faculties for outstanding teaching. Three examples are the Ameritech and Dean's Teaching Awards given by the College of Business Administration and the College of Science and Technology Teaching Award.

Several campus publications highlight faculty members’ successes in teaching and professional growth. Among them are *Inside CMU* (which appears each Monday), Off-Campus Program's *On Target* (a quarterly publication), and *Spotlight* (the occasional newsletter of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs).

**Budget decisions show that teaching and learning is CMU’s highest priority**

CMU has been forced to make extensive budget reductions over the past three years as a result of decreasing state appropriations and midyear callbacks. The university places the highest priority in budgeting on its academic functions. This is demonstrated by the fact that the president’s 18-member budget advisory committee (Senior Staff Budget Advisory Group), which recommended internal funds reductions, included eleven members from the academic division: all six academic deans, the dean of students, dean of libraries, graduate dean, ProfEd vice president and the provost. During one of the several budget-cutting periods that were forced upon the university by the state, President Rao made the public statement (February 2003):

“The university's top priority has been and will remain student and faculty learning, with a focus on teaching and research.”

---
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In the same statement, Rao indicated that teaching positions would not be compromised during budget reductions, and that the university’s plan to increase tenured faculty positions would not be altered:

“A commitment was made in the 2002-2003 budget to fund 50 new and replacement full-time faculty positions and to increase the number of regular faculty positions to nearly 700. At this time, 60 regular faculty positions remain unfilled because of retirements, resignations and unsuccessful searches. If all authorized searches are successful during this recruiting year, we will have 686 regular faculty members for 2003-2004. As a priority, subject to the implementation of future state budget reductions, I remain committed to the levels of full-time equivalent and regular faculty that have been approved in this academic year”

In the periods mentioned in the president’s remarks, the academic division received the smallest percentage budget reduction and the number of faculty actually increased slightly (see Tables 4-5 and 4-6, Chapter 4, Preparing for the Future for budget figures and additional discussion of budget reductions).

Academic areas have generally been a priority in capital budgeting as well. Over the past 10 years the campus has acquired funding to construct a Music Building (1997) and a Health Professions Building (2004), to significantly enlarge and completely update the library (2002), and to renovate several other academic buildings. On the other hand, there have also been significant investments made in new athletic facilities and in residence halls, decisions which did not involve substantial faculty input.

Even though the budget reductions have been proportionally less for the academic areas, these have been affected. Mentioned elsewhere in this report are cuts to the units responsible for diversity issues and for professional development for faculty. There are continuing needs for an equipment replacement budget and technical staff in several departments. A ubiquitous series of reductions that have not been discussed are the gradual declines in supplies, equipment and travel monies at the college and department levels. President Rao’s interactions with academic departments have led him to establish increasing resources in these areas as a priority when funding is available.

**Evaluation of Core Component 3B**

CMU holds teaching and learning as its highest priority, as was recently reaffirmed in CMU 2010. The value CMU places on effective teaching is reflected in many ways. These include the important role it plays in faculty evaluation and reappointment, in the systems that have been institutionalized to evaluate teaching effectiveness, the formal programs to recognize teaching excellence, and the significant development programs for its faculty teaching both on- and off-campus. FaCIT is a significant institutional strength.
There are factors that threaten CMU’s ability to maintain conditions that promote learning. CMU has long operated with a student-to-faculty ratio that is much greater than comparable institutions. CMU has been able to maintain a fairly steady student-faculty ratio despite increasing enrollments and significant budget reductions. However, to create the kind of classroom environments in which faculty can meet their instructional goals and to achieve institutional priorities for the engagement of students with faculty, student-to-faculty ratios need to be reduced.

**CORE COMPONENT 3C**
The organization creates effective learning environments.

Providing learning environments that best serve all students is taken seriously at CMU as reflected in numerous university statements.

- **Core value**: Diversity and multiculturalism. Embracing multiple voices, perspectives, and ideas rather than the dominance of only one idea, person, faction, generation, race, culture, or religion.

- **Core value**: A sense of community. Encouraging a shared sense of belonging, the harnessing of energies and commitments to common goals, and the valuing of the contributions of all members to the whole.

- **Goal 6**: Design and develop innovative and effective learning systems to meet contemporary educational needs.

- **Goal 11**: Create and nurture an environment that attracts and retains students, faculty, and staff who embody and promote cultural, racial, and global diversity.

- **Goal 12**: Provide educational experiences and programs to enhance mutual trust, respect, understanding, and sense of community with people from all backgrounds and cultures and to ensure an international and global perspective.

- **Institutional priority I**: Create an environment that supports teaching and learning as the top priority.

- **Institutional priority II**: Provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and a global perspective.

Effective learning environments have been one of CMU’s top priorities for many years. There have therefore been significant investments in this area, ranging from the construction of cutting-edge classroom buildings to the creation of innovative programs for giving students opportunities overseas as part of their academic programs, and from support services for students at risk to an honors program for exceptionally well-prepared students. Programmatic efforts include a first-year experience course and programs to engage advanced students in research with faculty.
CMU recognizes that learning is enhanced when there is within the community diversity along many dimensions. The university therefore strives to create learning environments that are proactive in supporting a diverse community of learners. This work has involved taking stock of student needs and providing individual and group-specific support systems. As its many efforts attest, the university is committed to providing learning environments that meet the needs of all its students.

EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

**CMU focuses on academic standards in order to improve learning**

Learning environments at CMU have been strengthened by an ongoing campus priority to raise academic standards. In 2000-01, the CMU community engaged in extensive discussions about institutional priorities. A strong consensus emerged that “raising academic standards” for undergraduate students should be a key institutional goal for the coming years. This goal was consistent with the institution’s core values of “student-focused learning” and “striving for quality in all that we do.”

Each of the next three years, the Academic Senate and the provost’s office jointly sponsored an all-campus workshop to develop concrete proposals for raising academic standards at CMU. Early leadership for this initiative was provided by a committee of academic leaders, jointly convened by the provost and Academic Senate. An e-portfolio of the project is available on the Web. This group held annual campuswide meetings to engage the campus in conversations about standards and to monitor and encourage progress in key areas. Accomplishments included:

- A thorough review of the academic policies, seeking ways they might be revised to better support high standards;
- A formal statement of shared expectations for behaviors that enhance learning and would therefore be expected of students, faculty, departments, staff and administrators was developed and distributed widely;[57]
- Recommendations that the levels of mathematics and writing competency required of all CMU undergraduates be raised, some of which have been enacted;
- Efforts to reduce grade inflation, which resulted in two years in which the gradual and steady creep in average GPA that had been going on for over 20 years was arrested. The use of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness was promoted through a white paper and advocacy by the Academic Senate and provost.

Other actions to raise standards have been undertaken. A revision of the academic program review process to emphasize standards,

56 [www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/standards.htm](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/standards.htm)
student learning and continuous improvement was made. To encourage capstone courses in all majors, programs are allowed to charge a fee to cover exceptional costs. Standards were raised for what is expected of programs in their assessment of student learning, including sharing of findings with students and other stakeholders. Academic standards are emphasized in a revision of the orientation for new faculty. Workshops for faculty surrounding effective grading and raising expectations for students have been held for on- and off-campus faculty. Monitoring of compliance with the Academic Senate’s policies relative to teaching and learning (e.g., the mandated five-year updates for master course syllabi) was increased through the audit done as part of program review. The Honors Program has implemented a rigorous academic advising system to enforce standards and raise expectations. The First Year Experience course emphasized CMU’s expectations for new students.

Various surveys show a continuing interest in raising academic standards. Creating an environment supportive of rigor, increasing student engagement in learning, increasing shared expectations for learning, and reducing reliance on student opinions in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness are priorities among the faculty and staff. An external reviewer of the raising academic standards initiative was very impressed with the progress to date, but recommended a greater focus in the future on a more limited set of issues.

The success of the raising academic standards initiative has been monitored in various ways. One is average grades, and Figure 5-9 shows that the steady increase in student grades that began in 1993 has been arrested. Another is the Level of Academic Challenge benchmark score within NSSE. The negative scores for CMU, shown in Table 5-8, indicate we have not been as successful in increasing the overall level of challenge in CMU courses. CMU 2010 includes strategies for continuing to work on this initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First-year students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Institutional Engagement index indicates, in standardized residuals, the extent to which an institution’s students exceed or fall short of a predicted benchmark score relative to all other NSSE institutions. CMU’s negative index reflects performance that is lower than expectations.
CMU has many programs designed to broaden students’ learning and enrich and add value to their CMU academic experience. Some are directly linked to academic coursework and programs, and these are described in this chapter. Others are more related to enriching the academic experience and promoting a lifetime of learning and typically are not directly linked to academics work; these are described in Chapter 6, The Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge, Core Component 4A. Student organizations, residence life, health and fitness, volunteerism and work experiences are examples of these co-curricular activities that are covered in Chapter 6. All types of programs are evaluated, and adapted as necessary, in CMU’s ongoing pursuit of excellence.

Library services

CMU’s library offers user-friendly services that orient students to using library holdings as well as accessing information available electronically. These services include an extensive Web page with tutorials, subject guides for students, a course (LIB 197), library tours as part of orientation, and contacts for off-campus students.

Research and creative activity

Within CMU 2010, CMU reaffirms research as an institutional priority, with student engagement in that research being the most important rationale for the priority in the minds of the campus. As described earlier in this chapter, Core Component B, many students enrich their core academic experience by working with faculty on research projects. A significant number of projects culminate in local and national presentations (see Table 5-8). CMU hopes to expand these opportunities so more students can augment their core academic experience in this way.

First-Year Experience Course (FYE)

Developed in response to retention trends, this one-credit elective course helps to orient first-semester first-year students to the expectations of university life and provides them with tools and access to resources intended to improve their ability to succeed in college life. Surveys of students taking FYE found that “students placed high value on three main aspects of the course: 1) the ways in which the course promoted student engagement with the campus, 2) how the course facilitated relationships between students, and 3) the knowledge the course provided about campus resources.” FYE includes an active mentor program in which junior and senior students serve as teaching assistants.

58 www.lib.cmich.edu/
59 www.lib.cmich.edu/departments/reference/instruct/tutorials.htm
60 ocls.cmich.edu/
61 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/SurveyFindings/ SurveySummaryAllCampusNov.pdf, p.17
62 www.fye.cmich.edu/
assistants for the class. An unanticipated outcome revealed in our assessments of this program was the significant impact the mentoring experience had on the mentors — an effect possibly as great as what the course imparts to the first-year students.

**Study abroad**

Encouraging students to develop more global perspectives through study abroad programs has been a recent emphasis. Coordination for study abroad and most other international educational programming is provided by the Office of International Education. Their data show increasing numbers of students are taking advantage of these opportunities. Sixty percent of the CMU students who study overseas do so within programs sponsored by the eight national and international consortia to which CMU belongs. Another 33% go on trips led by CMU faculty, generally for periods of less than one month in duration. Figure 5-10 shows significant increases — almost 60% — in the number of CMU students participating in study abroad programs since 1999. Still, participants represent only 2% of the undergraduate population, and there is a desire to involve more students.

CMU’s second institutional priority for 2005–2010 is “provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and a global perspective.” Better integration of international programs into the curriculum and campus life and the involvement of greater numbers of students in study abroad have been identified as strategies to be pursued over the next five years. Funding will be critical to success, and some progress has been made as the result of private donations specifically targeted to international study.

**Internships**

CMU offers numerous internship opportunities for students. The Web link shows those coordinated through the Career Services office. Many more internships are arranged through departmental and college contacts and formal agreements maintained in Academic Affairs. Evaluation of the effectiveness of internships is left to the sponsoring department. The community focus group held in conjunction with this self-study suggested CMU should do more monitoring of internships and this idea is being considered.

**Leadership Institute**

The Leadership Institute is one of the larger and more active co-curricular programs available to CMU students. Established in 1998, its objective is to develop the next generation of ethical leaders who will assume key positions in their professions and communities. The Institute provides campuswide coordination for student leadership development and education. Popular programs such as the semester-
long Alpha Leadership Experience, LeaderShape, and the Connections Leadership Conference help students develop their leadership competencies and skills from basic to advanced levels. Participation in the institute’s programs and activities grew from 1,590 students the initial year to more than 4,300 during 2003-2004. However, the goals established when the institute was formed to extend leadership development opportunities to K-12 students and to midlevel managers in both the profit and nonprofit sectors have been abandoned as a result of budget cuts. Given that these goals are more tangential to CMU’s mission, this has not caused problems.

**CMU works to have a diverse campus community**

CMU appreciates the importance of having students exposed to diverse ideas and ways of viewing issues. For example, a diverse student body can promote understanding of and respect for differences in culture, ethnicity, and religious beliefs. The university works in several ways to achieve learning environments that include diversity as a characteristic. Strong admissions and affirmative action policies coupled with goals established in CMU’s Strategic Plan for Achieving Diversity and CMU 2010 are used to seek more diversity by attracting students, faculty and staff from underrepresented groups. Figure 5-11 shows that the percentage of minority students enrolled on-campus has increased, but only slightly. The situation for minority faculty and staff is similar, having increased from 9.0% of CMU’s workforce in Fall 2000 to 10.8% in Fall 2004. CMU also seeks to increase diversity by recruiting students from other states and countries. Figure 5-12 shows that the number of international students on-campus has significantly declined since the September 11, 2001 attack. Overall, progress toward achieving the established goals has been slow, as reported in the Status Report on Diversity 1995–2000, and later in the 2004 Report Card on the State of Diversity at CMU. A more complete discussion of this topic along with the data on which this summary is based are in the discussion of Core Component 1B in Chapter 3, Mission and Integrity.

**CMU provides services to support student achievement**

In assisting students to meet expectations, CMU has developed numerous support services, including those that aid students in mastering the skills that contribute to academic success.

**Advising services**

First-year undergraduates begin their academic advisement through academic advisors assigned to the residence halls. For other students
there is also an academic advising office in the Student Services Center. Once students choose a major field of study, they are assigned a faculty advisor within that field. Centralized advising services was an area particularly hard hit in budget cuts. Surveys of current students and alumni suggest it is an area that is not rated as highly as others. We do not have a good understanding of the precise nature of student or alumni concerns, nor whether these concerns are with the centralized advising services or the faculty advisors in academic departments.

Supplemental instruction

This was created to provide additional assistance for historically difficult courses in which the combined failure, withdrawal and “D” grade rate ranged 30% or higher. For each course, supplemental instructors (graduate students or advanced undergraduate students) conduct weekly review sessions that engage students with more supported assistance in studying and comprehending course material.

Tutoring services

Free tutoring services are provided for any CMU students through the Office of Academic Advising and Assistance. Tutoring is available for all 100 and 200 level courses, all University Program courses, as well as speech and mathematics competency courses.

Courses to improve academic skills

The Office of Academic Advising and Assistance offers three to four courses that each focus on improving different segments of academic skills, including reading, studying, and time management.

ProfEd orientation for distance learning students

Many off-campus students are nontraditional students. These students are often older than the typical 18-22 year old students, are working, and may have had limited exposure to higher education. ProfEd’s online orientation takes advantage of the latest web technologies to introduce students to what will be expected of them as they pursue their CMU degrees and help them develop strategies for how to be successful.

Writing Center

The Writing Center provides assistance to on- and off-campus, graduate and undergraduate students as they develop their writing skills and prepare written assignments. More than a proofreading or editing consultation resource, the Writing Center works to increase student proficiency in using writing as an academic tool. In conjunction with CMU 2010, the Writing Center will expand in Fall 2005 to include

---

73 Noel-Levitz
74 alumni survey 2005
75 www.diversity.cmich.edu/mss/SI.htm
76 advising.cmich.edu/aap/tutoring_services.htm
77 advising.cmich.edu/aap/course_offering.htm
78 ddlcampus.cmich.edu/orientation/new/orient.htm
79 www.chsbs.cmich.edu/writing%5Fcenter
professional development for faculty as they strengthen their own abilities to become more effective writing coaches for their students.

**CMU tailors learning environments to meet the needs and interests of students**

A rich learning environment recognizes the heterogeneity of students and incorporates their needs and interests in its design. The faculty and physical facilities are foundations upon which other programs designed to meet students’ special needs build. CMU has established many such specialized learning environments based on the needs and interests of individual students and groups of students.

**Honors Program**

CMU recognizes that academically talented students need challenging learning experiences that acknowledge their intellectual capacities. The Honors Program was created in 1961 to provide these students with opportunities commensurate with their abilities and interests. Students take honors classes, complete a senior project, and become involved with peers in program events and activities. A somewhat unique aspect of this program is the service requirement that connects honors students with opportunities to serve the community. The program has been particularly successful in engaging students in scholarly activity under the guidance of faculty members.

Two years ago the Honors Program began a systematic effort to raise academic standards within the program to increase its quality and make it more attractive to CMU’s brightest students and prospective students. Expectations within the senior research project were raised and formalized. Advising given to students was improved, as was the four-year graduation rate. For the first time, a master schedule of honors courses, designed by the honors director, was established by the provost and implemented by the college deans. The Honors Council approved higher standards for admission to the Honors Program. Recommendations emerging from last year’s program review of honors include formalizing expectations for and review of faculty teaching honors courses. New facilities were also seen as highly desirable and the feasibility of private funding for such is being explored by CMU’s capital campaign consultants. These changes are expected to enhance the experiences of students in the Honors Program.

**Residential colleges**

Responding to evidence accumulated by other institutions regarding the positive effects of academically-based residential living collaborations for students in the sciences, the College of Science and Technology designed and launched a residential college in 2000. Successful implementation of this idea is revealed in increased retention rates in
that college’s programs and increased student grade point averages.\textsuperscript{83} The success of this effort has led to the development of four more similar residential-style colleges within other disciplines.\textsuperscript{84}

**Nontraditional students**

CMU has had a longstanding commitment to create access to its programs for all students. In the 1970s, CMU created several off-campus programs in an effort to meet the needs of working adults who lacked access to such programs. CMU’s off-campus programs unit, ProfEd, has had significant success in meeting the needs of the minority populations as evidenced by the national recognition it receives regularly in *Black Issues in Higher Education* as one of the nation’s leaders in granting graduate degrees to students from underrepresented groups. In recent years, CMU’s commitment to nontraditional (and other) students has expanded to include new delivery methods for courses and programs, including distance-learning formats and asynchronous scheduling. CMU strives to provide convenient, timesaving services, without sacrificing high academic standards. Further discussion of ProfEd is in Chapter 7, *Engagement and Service*.

**At-risk students**

Each year first-year students living in the residence halls take the College Student Inventory, which provides a profile for each student that identifies his or her characteristics and risk factors. Students’ profiles are reviewed and students given advice about campus services and learning opportunities that might be of particular use or interest to them, based on their profiles. This service is believed to be of particular value to at-risk students.

**International students**

Support services (e.g., visa consultation) and programming are offered to CMU’s international students through the Office of International Education. Students pursuing intensive English language studies also receive support and programming through the English Language Institute. As a result of an active partnership with the Mt. Pleasant community, many CMU international students also have ‘host families’ or designated conversation partners to enrich their connections and cultural experiences while in Mt. Pleasant.

**Students from underrepresented groups**

The Office for Institutional Diversity\textsuperscript{85} has leadership responsibility for helping the campus to foster environments comfortable for individuals from all groups, but particularly those who are underrepresented on campus. Units within Institutional Diversity have a dual purpose of meeting the needs of particular students, as well as promoting richer appreciation among the campus for the dimensions and dynamics

\textsuperscript{83} www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/MP.pdf
\textsuperscript{84} www.reslife.cmich.edu/CommunityLiving/ResidentialColleges/residentialColleges.shtml
\textsuperscript{85} www.diversity.cmich.edu/programs2AAA.htm
of diversity. These units include Minority Student Services, Native American Programs, and the Multicultural Education Center, all of which sponsor workshops and events intended to create greater awareness and understanding of multicultural issues. We place special importance on these workshops and events because of the lack of diversity in the local community and the need to expose students to multiple perspectives as preparation for life and work in today’s global society. Unfortunately many of these events are plagued by poor student participation, as reported by students in a series of student surveys 1998–2002. \(^{86,87}\)

**Student athletes**

CMU makes extensive efforts to facilitate the academic needs of its student athletes. Athletes are provided with such services as advising, tutoring, and accommodations for scheduling their courses. These efforts have been successful as measured by grade point averages and graduation rates of CMU’s athletes and recognition of CMU students with academic All-American awards.

**Gay/lesbian students**

The Office of Gay & Lesbian Programs\(^{88}\) is housed within the Office for Institutional Diversity. Educational events and activities are sponsored through this office to increase awareness of gay and lesbian issues. This office also provides support services to gay and lesbian campus members. Occasional flare-ups of hostility on campus signal that greater efforts are necessary to establish tolerance. In addition, there is concern that the half-time director position is insufficient for the successful implementation of programs; budget concerns have prevented increasing this position to full-time.

**Special needs students**

Student Disability Services\(^{89}\) is also part of the Office for Institutional Diversity. This office assists students with disabilities with services and academic accommodations on an individual basis. A full-time director, a part-time learning disabilities specialist, and an adaptive technologies technician oversee needs in this area. Since the 1960s, the university has maintained a disabilities advisory committee or similar group to assess facilities and implement as needed modification of the university environment. For example, wheelchair access exists throughout campus, rooms used for academic purposes are labeled appropriately for visually impaired individuals, and adaptive technology has been implemented in selected classrooms with additional equipment available in residence halls, computer labs, and in Park Library.

\(^{86}\) [www.chsbs.cmich.edu/carrs/REPORTS.HTM](http://www.chsbs.cmich.edu/carrs/REPORTS.HTM); [www.chsbs.cmich.edu/carrs/Stud02 Final report.pdf](http://www.chsbs.cmich.edu/carrs/Stud02 Final report.pdf), p.50

\(^{87}\) [www.chsbs.cmich.edu/carrs/Stud02 Final report.pdf](http://www.chsbs.cmich.edu/carrs/Stud02 Final report.pdf)

\(^{88}\) [www.diversity.cmich.edu/glp/default.htm](http://www.diversity.cmich.edu/glp/default.htm)

\(^{89}\) [www.cmich.edu/student-disability/](http://www.cmich.edu/student-disability/)
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Student Disability Services supplies faculty and staff with informative presentations and ongoing support to ensure that students with disabilities have equal access to all university programs, services, and activities. Faculty Personnel Services provides faculty and teaching staff with a handbook that identifies resources available on campus and helps them effectively accommodate students with special needs. Student Disability Services also provides students with a handbook that details its programs, services, and policies. In recent years, as the result of budget cuts, this unit has assumed additional responsibility for providing accommodation to students taking course exams. The demands for such services have been expanded and exceeded expectations. This has proved to be a significant drain on the unit.

Students’ learning styles

Students’ learning styles differ, so CMU faculty are encouraged to consider this factor in designing their courses and course materials. To support this effort, FaCIT provides workshops and other resources that assist faculty in integrating new teaching and assessment methods into their courses. A significant number of faculty employ non-lecture teaching modalities that include more active learning. Examples include group projects, cooperative learning, peer instruction, and online formats. Most faculty report using teaching methodologies other than lecture, with only 13% using lecture over 75% of the class time while over 40% lecture less than 30% of the time.\(^9\)

Assessment results are used to improve curriculum, pedagogy, instructional resources, and student services

The practice of using assessment of student learning and evaluations of academic and student services is found throughout the institution and this self-study. Below are examples of some of the significant institutional initiatives aimed at improving student learning that have resulted from the review of evidence emerging from various assessment and evaluation efforts.

- The First Year Experience Course was developed in response to concerns over student retention data. Representatives of the faculty and administration met on numerous occasions to discuss ways that the university could improve in this area; the First Year Experience course was developed as a result of those discussions. This first-year student orientation class is geared to assist those students in successfully negotiating university-level academic expectations.

- The Raising Academic Standards initiative grew out of the review of campus survey results during the mission revision process. A consensus that academic performance was an important issue prompted a large initiative to revise policies and expectations to promote higher academic standards.

---

\(^9\) Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSEE), 2003
• Assessments by composition faculty were instrumental in drawing attention to student writing deficiencies. A large initiative is now underway to uncover more specifics of the deficiencies and weaknesses in university instruction that affect student writing.

• Results from the Noel-Levitz survey informed changes and additions to student services with respect to housing, dining, advising, counseling, and technology assistance.

• As a routine part of its service, FaCIT surveys faculty participating in all professional development activities. Continuous improvement of such activities is an ongoing process. Resources are created/modified based on faculty feedback data.

• Technology instructional resources are monitored through an ongoing faculty feedback system. Those resources that fail to perform according to faculty needs are modified or replaced in order to meet standards of use.

**Graduation rates substantiate the effectiveness of CMU’s learning environments**

A widely accepted indicator of success among universities is the graduation rate. CMU’s six-year graduation rate compared to those of the benchmark institutions is shown in Figure 5-13. CMU ranks near the middle of its comparison group. In a similar comparison with doctoral institutions based on data accumulated by *U.S. News and World Report* for its Best Colleges Ranking, CMU was 60 out of 248 doctoral institutions. The use of the six-year graduation rate as a Key Performance Indicator in *CMU 2010* reflects the institution’s desire to gradually increase the number of students who graduate within six years. The Strategic Planning Committee is in the process of proposing targets for those rates.

**Figure 5-13. Six-Year Graduation Rates for Benchmark Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University-Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91 See Table 8-1, Chapter 8, *Special Emphasis.*
EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 3C

Learning environments at CMU are rich and varied, serving CMU’s heterogeneous student body. Raising academic standards has been a priority for the institution for five years and the associated initiatives have strengthened the learning environment in important ways. CMU provides its students with many excellent opportunities to enrich their educational experience. Most students take advantage of at least one of these opportunities and recognize its value. There is an interest in expanding the number of students engaged in research and creative activity with faculty and who study abroad. Support services also are working well as evidenced by surveys of students and CMU’s six-year graduation rate. Better understanding of the effectiveness of advising in service centers and academic departments would be beneficial to the campus. Attention to the expanding role of Student Disability Services is also warranted.

CMU’s off-campus programs offer excellent access to education for nontraditional students. High minority student enrollments characterize many of these programs and provide evidence for CMU’s success in making access possible for multiple student populations. On-campus minority enrollments lag far behind those in off-campus programs, meaning that the university is not meeting its goals to serve all segments of Michigan’s population. The lack of diversity among students, staff and faculty also hinders the university’s goal to achieve cultural, racial, and global diversity. CMU does offer a wide range of programming and offices supporting the diversity efforts.

CORE COMPONENT 3D

The organization’s learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.

CMU understands the importance of providing the necessary resources to make student learning and effective teaching possible. This commitment is stated in three of the goals of the university’s mission statement.

Goal 7: Use modern technologies to enhance teaching, learning, research, and administrative functions.

Goal 9: Provide support services and a physical environment that foster student success

Goal 14: Attract and manage resources to enable faculty, staff, and students to be successful in meeting these goals.

As discussed below, institutional follow-through on these commitments is strong. The university provides a great deal of support for all facets of learning. As a result, CMU has a strong technological and pedagogical infrastructure and in many ways is poised to meet the needs of learners as opportunities arise. In addition, the university takes into account needs for continuing maintenance and support of learning resources when making decisions.
EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

Students have access to resources that enhance learning

As described in Chapter 4, Preparing for the Future, CMU has invested substantially in providing high-quality facilities and resources for student use in completing their academic programs. This is true for all students, including those who have special needs for specific accommodations. Highlights of these learning resources are described in more detail below.

Academic buildings

The present instructional space accommodates the needs of the current student population; in fact, a study of campus capacity in 2001 revealed that instructional building space did not limit student enrollment, which at the time was 18,470. Anticipating the additional 175,000 square feet of space that would be created by the construction of the Health Professions Building, the committee concluded that the university had enough vacant instructional space to accommodate a larger student enrollment. Nevertheless, instructional space is not overly abundant.

Figure 5-14 shows CMU’s gross square footage per student compared to other Michigan public universities grouped by Carnegie classification. CMU was near the bottom for doctoral institutions at the time of the study in 2000. With the construction of the Health Professions Building, the ratio has somewhat improved.

Figure 5-14. Gross Square Footage per Student for Michigan Public Institutions (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of M – Ann Arbor (D-RE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State U (D-RE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State U (D-RE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan U (D-RE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Tech U (D-RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU (on-campus students) (D-RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland U (D-RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior State U (M-II)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan State U (M-I)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State U (M-II)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M Flint (M-I)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley State U (M-I)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan U (M-I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M Dearborn (M-I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State U (M-I)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data used to construct this graph are found on p. 6 of the June 2001 Campus Capacity and Optimal Sizing Report.
The three most recently constructed classroom buildings provide CMU with state-of-the-art laboratory and research facilities (Dow Science Building), performance and practice facilities (Music Building), and clinical facilities (Health Professions Building) that meet the needs of current academic programming. However, even though older buildings have been upgraded with instructional technology, some are in need of remodeling and/or structural rehabilitation. These include Ronan Hall, which houses teacher education programs, and Anspach Hall, a major classroom building. The state legislature has recently approved funding for a portion of the project to renovate Ronan Hall. There is also an interest in upgrading the facilities and visibility of the Honors Program, which is located in one of the older residence halls on campus.

**Equipment**

Research and teaching equipment in the newer classroom buildings are some of the campus's finest. Cutting-edge equipment can also be found in other areas across campus and in the Center for Applied Research. CMU faculty and staff have been successful in securing federal funding for purchase of some large equipment items. An ongoing concern for the campus is how to address the need to update and replace equipment used in teaching and research, particularly the more expensive items. Presently, no plan or budget is in place to do so.

**State-of-the-art library**

CMU’s Park Library was extensively enlarged and upgraded during a $50 million construction project that was completed in 2002. The new library blends the traditional collections of a major academic library with advanced, computer-networked information resources and services. The new library building contains:

- Patron seating for 2,655;
- Thirty-three miles of electronically assisted, user-accessible, moveable, compact shelving and total storage space for more than 1.3 million volumes;
- More than 350 public computer workstations and 2,000-plus network connections to access information resources from around the world;
- An auditorium for lectures, films, and other events;
- Technology-equipped classrooms and group-study rooms;
- Faculty study offices;
- An extended hours study room;
- A coffee bar.

The level of student satisfaction with the new library is high. CMU students rated the library resources and services a 5.88 on a seven point scale, which is 0.73 points higher than the mean for four-year public institutions that were part of the 2003 Noel-Levitz survey of Student Satisfaction.

---

92 www.lib.cmich.edu
Off-Campus Library Services (OCLS)

OCLS provides access to library and reference materials for CMU’s off-campus students. In an end-of-course survey, as shown in Figure 5-15, students report being favorably impressed with OCLS’s contributions to helping them achieve course learning objectives. From 6,035 responses, 71.6% rated the value of the library’s services for achieving course objectives as “very high” or “high.”

Instructional technology

CMU has made significant investments in instructional technology over the past five years. The Faculty Technology Planning Committee provided the direction for the investment in a comprehensive upgrade of campus technology infrastructure for the purpose of strengthening teaching and learning. The outcome of their efforts was a four-year investment strategy called The Learning Initiative for the Incoming Class of 2002. The strategy called for the following:

- Establish a student computer ownership policy,
- Implement a technology-enhanced classroom program,
- Adopt a campuswide course management system standard,
- Institute a faculty computing and teaching initiative,
- Develop the university network,
- Institutionalize an exemplary user support program.

The university has made substantial progress in meeting these goals as described in the progress report, 2003 Report on Instructional Technology at CMU. There were significant investments in equipment, faculty training, and troubleshooting for the mediated classrooms:

“To date, 233 out of the 265 rooms identified by deans and faculty for electronic mediation have been completed. We are 88% complete and will finish this task within the next 6 months. Approximately $3.5 million has been invested on classroom mediation. This investment has paid significant dividends in enhancing the learning environment at CMU. Seventy-two percent of faculty surveyed in 2003 rated the importance of mediated classroom equipment as High; another 21% rated it as Medium. Additionally, 92% of our students rated the importance of mediated classrooms as High to Medium. The CMU Student Technology fees funded the majority of the six key areas identified in the initial framework. The entire Information Technology (IT) organization has been involved in the development and support for this initiative.” (Excerpted from the executive summary)

Since this report was issued, all classrooms designated to become mediated have been outfitted as requested, bringing all 265 rooms (100%) into mediated status. These statistics are far ahead of the national average as illustrated in Figure 5-16 below.

---

94 www.it.cmich.edu/it/committee_ftpc.asp
95 www.it.cmich.edu/docs/ftpc/CMU_Learning_Init_2002.pdf
96 facit.cmich.edu/about/downloads/2003-Report-on-Instructional-Technology-at-CMU.pdf
Figure 5-16. Percentage of Classrooms Nationwide Equipped with Various Learning Technologies

An external review of information technology in 2005 by Edutech International echoed this overall positive picture, but noted some areas for improvement. Their final report articulated the following as the most significant points in an overall evaluation that CMU is doing quite well.97

1. The facilities are quite good; there has been good use of technology fee money and other investments.

2. CMU faculty are at about the same point as faculty from other institutions in incorporating technology into the learning process.

3. The university is quite a bit behind in student administrative systems, but is taking significant steps to catch up.

4. Wireless coverage of the campus is behind other comparable institutions.

5. This has all been done in a budget-cutting environment, making it even more outstanding.

The report contained a number of specific recommendations, many of which are currently being implemented. These included revamping the leadership and committee structure for IT to promote more engagement of the user communities; creating a strategic plan for IT; enhancing partnerships between centralized and decentralized IT services; increasing IT staff and funding; developing service level agreements; instituting a replacement program for hardware; and pausing the SAP-CM project to evaluate quicker, lower cost alternatives.

Blackboard course management package
Also as a result of *The Learning Initiative for the Incoming Class of 2002*, CMU adopted Blackboard as the university-supported course management software. The university has since made strong efforts to advance Blackboard’s use by faculty and students, including the addition of support staff. The trend in Blackboard use is shown in Figure 5-17. As

---

of the academic year 2004-05, well over half of the on-campus faculty made use of Blackboard. A detailed study of the data shows that these results hold for temporary faculty and graduate teaching assistants as well as for regular faculty. Blackboard has greatly enhanced student access to faculty, to course information (e.g. syllabi), and to their records (e.g. grades and test results) in a way that is efficient for both faculty and students.

The extent to which Blackboard or any of the other learning technologies impact student learning is a subject that has been receiving national attention for a number of years. CMU has begun to more systematically explore the connections between learning technologies and learning in CMU classes. We expect that such evidence will inform CMU’s decisions regarding future deployments of these rapidly evolving and sometimes expensive technologies.

**Support for off-campus students**

CMU’s off-campus programs enlarge the university’s student base by roughly 30 percent beyond those enrolled in Mt. Pleasant. In 2004, over 8,000 off-campus students took classes online or at one of 60 sites. These include 14 sites in Michigan, 31 sites in 15 states other than Michigan, 6 sites in Canada, and 2 sites in Mexico. Since CMU has been offering off-campus courses for over 30 years, the university has developed significant expertise in enhancing student learning through nontraditional delivery formats. As discussed above, its library services (OCLS) and orientation programs have received national attention. Regular student satisfaction surveys lead to ongoing program improvements. In addition, the university has begun experimenting to find ways to provide writing support services to off-campus students as part of its goal to provide the same levels of service to all of its students.

**CMU provides support for its learning resources**

CMU’s learning resources are generally supported with the requisite staff/campus expertise needed for efficient use. Many classroom technology resources in particular have few barriers to implementation; training and trouble-shooting support is available at all levels of the university.

**Technology training for faculty and students**

Training in computer-based technology is excellent at CMU. FaCIT oversees training in instructional technologies, including the use of Blackboard. There are a number of faculty who have successfully integrated advanced technologies into their work, some of whom have been identified and supported as part of the Champions Project. In health professions, for example, some faculty who use virtual reality anatomy techniques share their expertise with other faculty desiring to learn how to apply virtual reality technology. Table 5-9 shows that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Level</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>CMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designated instructional technology center</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty teaching/excellence center that works with IT</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional designers who work with technologists</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technologists who are discipline specialists</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive support for faculty using technology</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty training through scheduled seminars</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty training upon request</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for faculty who use technology</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table originally appeared on p. 18 of the 2003 Report on Instructional Technologies at CMU.

---

98 facit.cmich.edu/major-initiatives/champions.html
CMU compared well in a 2003 study with the level and extent of support typically provided by other institutions.

Staff for technology-intensive areas

The university also invests in support for discipline-specific technologies. The Department of Chemistry devotes a full-time professional staff person to operating and maintaining a high-field nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer in order that faculty and students may have ready access to this valuable research and teaching tool. The Department of Geography staffs its Center for Geographic Information Science (CGISc) with technicians in order to be able to provide state-of-the-art geospatial research tools to students and faculty as well as non-CMU researchers. These represent two of many such examples at CMU.

Given that as a campus CMU is understaffed (see Figure 4-7 in Chapter 4, Preparing for the Future), it is no surprise that technical staff are in short supply in some areas. For example, the 2004-05 program review cycle produced recommendations for adding technical staff for support of teaching laboratories in Apparel Merchandising and Design and in Health Fitness. Budgets are the key limitation, yet these needs are considered sufficiently important that the relevant deans are seeking new and or reallocated funds for these positions.

Rapid trouble-shooting assistance

The university has developed a multi-level assistance program to respond to faculty, students and staff running into technical difficulties with instructional technologies. Mediated classrooms, for example, are linked by telephone to a unit in the Office of Information Technology that responds immediately (within 5 minutes) to a faculty member needing assistance with malfunctioning classroom equipment. This same unit significantly reduces the need for such calls by running frequent quality control checks on all mediated equipment in all classrooms.

At another level, five of the colleges have one or more technicians who work with faculty, staff and students in trouble-shooting computer difficulties, both hardware and software. Phone consultation on information technology questions is available from a “Help Desk,” which employs CMU students as its first level of support. Callers to the helpdesk are regularly surveyed to evaluate the effectiveness of the help provided.

Staff for experiential learning opportunities

Experiential learning was discussed earlier in this chapter. In order to effectively improve the extent and depth of these opportunities, the university has invested in services and personnel. Internships are partially supported through Academic Affairs, Career Services, Volunteer Center and the colleges. Student teaching is supported through the Center for Student Services in the College of Education and Human Services, which has the responsibility for scheduling, organizing
and evaluating the student teaching program. Several departments have professional staff positions that provide services directly related to laboratory learning situations. These include lab coordinator/manager positions in chemistry, biology, and human environmental studies.

**Partnerships have been developed to enhance learning opportunities**

By collaborating with external groups, CMU has been able to augment the learning opportunities it offers to students. Collaboration also provides important channels for external feedback concerning the quality and currency of CMU programs. Some examples of cooperative partnerships are:

- The College of Education and Human Services has longstanding partnerships with local school districts.
- The admissions staff was increased so as to strengthen community college relations and recruitment.
- The Center for Applied Research and Technology facilitates partnerships among university, industry and government research entities to advance technology and strengthen economic development. Several undergraduate and graduate students are involved in research projects spawned by these partnerships.
- Partnerships with community groups occur through the Volunteer Center, service learning internships, student teaching and many more.

**CMU assesses the use and effectiveness of its resources in supporting and enhancing learning and teaching**

CMU uses a variety of evidence relative to the effectiveness of the resources that support and enhance learning and teaching. These include enrollment data, graduation and retention statistics, student characteristics, faculty, staff and student opinions, salaries, benefits and costs associated with academic programs. We track this information across time, and whenever possible seek comparative evidence from similar institutions. Increasingly, CMU is using external consultants to conduct systematic analyses and provide formative feedback on how services can be improved. Below are some examples of the wide range of evidence-gathering activities underway designed to continually evaluate and improve learning and teaching.

- *CMU 2010* established Key Performance Indicators, a number of which track the effectiveness of our learning resources. These measures will be collected regularly and disseminated to appropriate groups and summarized for the campus community.
- CMU benchmarks with 11 other institutions that are comparable or aspirational. This information provides a standard against which to compare CMU’s investment and support for teaching and learning. This evidence has figured prominently in budget
discussions within the academic division and for annual goal setting.

- CMU participates in a limited fashion in the Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity. This has given the campus useful information about our expenditures as compared to the expenditures of our peers for teaching and learning.

- ProfEd regularly surveys its students, seeking feedback on the programs and services offered through ProfEd that can be improved.\textsuperscript{99} Evidence from those surveys has been used to modify academic programs and improve services.

- Park Library collects data on use patterns and regularly solicits input from off-campus clients to assess its Off-Campus Library Services (OCLS) unit in such areas as document delivery and Web site use. Such input is used in developing annual plans.

- The Office of Information Technology collects statistics concerning technology use and problems. It also studies technology trends at benchmark institutions. In 2005 an external consultant provided an overall analysis of the IT operations and shared that information with the campus.\textsuperscript{100} This information is currently being used in the development of a strategic plan for IT.

- Facilities Management in 2005 sought an independent review of the quality of CMU’s facilities management by the Association for Higher Education Facilities Officers.\textsuperscript{101} The group gave CMU a “B” on the overall Facility Condition index. They described customer satisfaction as quite high, but uneven; at the same time they recommended improved survey and data collection techniques, more systematic benchmarking and other changes that would improve the overall facilities management operation.

- The Board of Trustees evaluates physical facility needs through Facilities Management reports and approves all projects involving major expenditures.

- The registrar prepares annual classroom utilization reports, which deans use for the determination of instructional space assignments.

- Some academic service units conduct regular surveys of their “customers” to identify areas for improvement and to establish grounds for recognizing staff. Academic Affairs, for example, annually requests feedback from individuals with whom it worked most closely.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{99} www.cel.cmich.edu/faculty/org-research.html
\textsuperscript{100} www.academicadministration.cmich.edu/documents/Edutech International Final Report 4.14.05.pdf
\textsuperscript{102} www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/Survey Findings/results.pdf
• FaCIT analyzes the use and impact of the Blackboard course management software and measures satisfaction with its workshops. This feedback is monitored on an ongoing basis and used to make real-time corrections and in annual planning.

• Some individual departments and colleges also collect benchmarking data or participate in benchmarking studies. Presently, for example, the College of Business Administration, the College of Education and Human Services and the College of Science and Technology are participating in such national efforts.

• CMU’s Office of Institutional Research regularly administers surveys of students and faculty that also provide rich comparative data. Results for all of these can be seen on their Web site. Key examples follow:

  ◦ National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). CMU has participated each year since 2001. Data are available for years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004. The Honors Program, First Year Experience and College of Science and Technology Residential College use NSSE results and locally developed surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs.

  ◦ Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). CMU participated in this study in 2003 and 2004.

  ◦ Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). This survey of first-year students was administered to CMU students in 1999 and 2001 and will continue in the future.

  ◦ Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey. CMU administered this survey in 2001 and 2003 and will continue to do so on a regular basis.

In short, there are many instances in which CMU is regularly and systematically collecting evidence regarding the effectiveness and use of our learning resources. This evidence is used to direct, redirect and improve those resources. While it is true that more data collection could benefit the campus, more importantly we must assure that the information is not only collected but makes it into the hands of key decision makers and is used in decision-making. These key decision makers include faculty and those staff who interact with students and make many of the decisions that impact student learning and the overall quality of students’ CMU experience.

EVAUULATION OF CORE COMPONENT 3D

CMU has many excellent classroom buildings and a newly renovated library. Library services for on- and off-campus students are considered good by those students. CMU’s IT operations also are strong, with continued areas for growth. In comparison with its peer institutions, CMU is a leader in terms of its mediation of classrooms. With its investment in FaCIT and instructional technologies, CMU is positioned
to provide its faculty with the necessary resources for developing more effective pedagogies and evaluating the impact of all pedagogies on learning within disciplines. CMU faculty are keeping abreast of new technologies in their use of technologies like Blackboard.

A significant strength of the institution is the way academic areas, particularly faculty lines, have been protected through significant budget reductions. Yet, concurrently some resources to support teaching and researching have been whittled away to balance budgets. Restoring some of these is a priority for the president. There has also been increasing use of evidence regarding CMU’s standing relative to an established group of benchmarking institutions in important decisions, including the setting of institutional priorities. Many service units that support the core academic missions are regularly collecting evidence that is used in planning and continuous improvement.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

STRENGTHS

1. **Assessment:** There is strong institutional support for assessment as reflected in CMU’s effective assessment policy, assessment infrastructure and management, and the increasing participation by departments.

2. **Teaching and Learning:** CMU has consistently made teaching and learning its highest priority and taken significant steps to raise academic standards.

3. **Support of Teaching:** CMU has invested in services to improve the teaching effectiveness of its faculty, with FaCIT being an institutional strength.

4. **Effective Learning Environments:** CMU has put extensive effort and resources into having up-to-date academic buildings and creating policies and infrastructure to promote effective learning environments for students with varying needs. CMU has committed to the importance of multiculturalism in preparing students for the modern world.

5. **Off-Campus Programs:** 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.

6. **Experiential Learning:** CMU offers good experiential learning opportunities that include opportunities developed through partnering with external groups.

CONCERNS

1. **Assessment:** Some academic programs have not met institutional assessment requirements. Available assessment data need to
be more widely shared with relevant stakeholders and used for program improvement.

2. **Student-to-Faculty Ratio:** While CMU has maintained a steady student-to-faculty ratio, comparisons with benchmarking institutions reveal that this ratio is high relative to similar doctoral/research-intensive universities.

3. **Instructional Technology:** 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 used to improve student learning.

4. **Competing Priorities:** 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. **Diversity:** The lack of progress in increasing on-campus student diversity means that CMU is not meeting its goal to serve all student populations. This also inhibits CMU’s achievement of a campus environment that helps students understand their increasingly diverse and connected world.

6. **Curriculum:** CMU’s complex curricular structure hinders assessment and advising and the implementation of the new student information system and an automated degree audit system.

7. **Budget:** Budget reductions have led to cutbacks in areas that are important aspects of the long-term health of CMU’s support of the learning of its students and faculty. Reductions in support for faculty travel and professional development at institutional, college and department levels, academic advising, and technical support staff are the areas that are of present concern. The absence of a plan for replacement of teaching and research equipment is something that looms on the horizon.

8. **Decision-making:** 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.
CHAPTER 6
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The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.
CRITERION FOUR

The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

CMU values lifelong learning and demonstrates this value through its mission, programs, and its general support of activities that enhance intellectual growth. Beginning with its general education philosophy, the university believes that a foundation in liberal arts will provide students with intellectual tools instrumental to a life of learning. In the words of a founder,

“Education in its best and truest sense is a much larger thing than any or even all of the so-called practical uses that may be made of it. Accordingly . . . the school shall stand squarely and strongly for the larger idea, that education is a rightful heritage of the human soul. . . . Breadth and liberality of scope will always prove the better investments in the long run.”

This commitment to “breadth and liberality of scope” in education is reflected in CMU’s general education program and in its numerous and varied co-curricular offerings. These cultivate critical thinking, social responsibility, and cultural awareness, characteristics that are the foundation for lifelong learning. Campus intellectual and cultural programming also play important roles enriching the experience of CMU students as well as that of the surrounding community.

In the academy, lifelong learning is closely related to research and creative activity. This area has received much attention at CMU in the past five years as the university increased its emphasis on scholarship. The expanded focus on scholarship emerged in large part from work on one of the institutional priorities for the period of 2000 to 2005: “to enhance graduate education,” which in practice became an emphasis on the scholarly engagement of graduate and undergraduate students. Whether in the classroom, the research lab, or the studio, the creative pursuit of new ways to understand and express ideas is now viewed as a key part of the educational process at CMU.

MISSION ELEMENTS

That CMU promotes a life of learning for its students, faculty, and staff is made evident in a several statements within the mission. With respect to the academic programs that directly impact student learning, the mission states:

[CMU’s] programs “encourage intellectual and moral growth, prepare students for meaningful careers and professions, instill the values of lifelong learning, and encourage civic responsibility, public service, and understanding among social groups in a global society.”

1 bulletins.cmich.edu/2004/ug/Gen_Info/Overview.asp#The Enduring Philosophy
With respect to the pursuit of new knowledge and its applications, the mission goes on to state:

“Central Michigan University encourages research, scholarship, and creative activity and promotes the scholarly pursuit and dissemination of new knowledge, artistic production, and applied research.”

CMU’s commitment to a life of learning also can be seen among our core values:

- Liberal education as the foundation of the undergraduate curriculum;
- The scholarship of discovery and creativity;
- Nurturing and encouraging personal growth;
- Respect and civility in the treatment of each other;
- Shared governance;
- Professional responsibility.

Finally, several of CMU’s goals — those actions by which CMU intends to accomplish its mission — also speak to the acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge.

**Goal 1:** Provide a quality, broad undergraduate education to prepare students for a thoughtful life of service to the community and as a base for future academic and professional work and to ensure that CMU students will be knowledgeable and skilled, liberally educated persons.

**Goal 3:** Offer graduate programs in niche areas that meet state, national and international needs.

**Goal 5:** Advance and disseminate knowledge by stimulating and supporting research and creative activities by students, faculty and staff.

**CORE COMPONENT 4A**

The organization demonstrates, through the actions of its board, administrators, students, faculty, and staff, that it values a life of learning.

CMU values a life of learning in which the creation and application of knowledge are skills that enable the continuous learner to enjoy intellectual life as well as to meet career and societal demands. CMU delivers on this value by proactively supporting numerous activities that promote learning outside the classroom. These include speakers and forums, cultural events, co-curricular programs, scholarly activity and creative endeavors, and the professional development of campus members, both students and non-students alike.
EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

CMU values and promotes a life of learning for its students, faculty and staff.

In March 2005, the Board of Trustees endorsed a new strategic plan, CMU 2010, which holds teaching and learning to be CMU’s top institutional priority. Resources at the institutional level and in each of the divisions have been dedicated to this priority.

CMU has invested in faculty and academic programs and preserved those investments through tough budgetary times, as detailed in Chapter 5, Student Learning and Effective Teaching. This section highlights our investments in special programs, co-curricular activities, professional development opportunities for staff, and support for the scholarship of faculty and students. Each of these kinds of activities contributes to our rich learning environment and fosters the learning of all members of the campus community. The following provides details concerning areas of strength as well as areas of concern as CMU seeks to nurture lifelong learning.

Special events and programming

CMU provides opportunities for enriched learning experiences through sponsorship of special events, speakers, cultural activities, performing arts and recreation; most of which are publicized through the Student Events Calendar and the Campus Events Calendar. In a 2004 survey of CMU faculty and staff, and a random sample of students, respondents expressed strong endorsement for CMU to continue to serve as a regional cultural center. As a result, maintaining this programming was incorporated as a priority within CMU 2010. Support for public broadcasting through CMU’s affiliate, WCMU, was similarly valued, and also figures prominently in CMU 2010.

CMU places a strong emphasis on student participation in such events and activities. That emphasis is evident to students, according to survey results shown in Figure 6-1. Compared to students from other doctoral/research-intensive universities, more CMU students reported an institutional emphasis on campus events and activities. Similarly, more CMU students reported that they attend artistic performances than did students from comparable institutions (Figure 6-2).

CMU considers these activities to be important in our students’ education. In 2002, CMU faculty conveyed their expectation that relevant university events should be a part of students’ general education.

---

2 www.planning.cmich.edu/VisionPlanApproved.pdf
3 allevents.cmich.edu/viewcalendar.asp
4 events.cmich.edu
5 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VisionPlanning/VisionSurveyAllResponsesOpenEnded.pdf
6 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/SurveyFindings/SurveySummaryAllCampusNov.pdf
7 www.wcmu.org/default.html
as reflected in the statement, which now appears in the University Program Basic Documents Set:

“Each course offered as part of the University Program is expected to include a requirement where practicable, that students attend at least one relevant out-of-class university event and provide a report or reflection on that experience as one component of their grade.”

Realizing this expectation is made difficult by logistical issues that the university is working to resolve. Faculty are not always aware of events far enough in advance to include them in their course syllabi. There are also conflicts in scheduling that arise with so many events and programs sponsored by many different units. A Web-based calendar* has been operational for a few years, but it still is not used widely enough to remedy these problems. Requiring registration on the University calendar prior to the assignment of certain rooms for events other than regular classes is being considered as one remedy.

Additionally, budget cuts in 2003 resulted in the elimination of two campuswide series — the Speaker’s Series and the Performing Arts Series. This action saved the university almost $100,000 and drew both negative and positive campus opinion. Some were dismayed by what they viewed as losses; others felt that these events were not well-attended enough to justify their expense.

In CMU 2010, one of the Year-One Initiatives is to study campus programming, attendance and resources. Study results should enable us to evaluate the overall level of programming, coordination and publicity issues, possible gaps in programming and appropriate means of funding. The study will also determine the impact of the elimination of the Speaker’s Series and Performing Arts Series to better determine whether such programs should be reinstated.

**Co-curricular experiences**

CMU students’ co-curricular options are many; those most closely aligned with academic work are described in Chapter 5, Core Component 3C. Other experiences like those associated with residence or student life are described below.

In Figure 6-3, students report that they spend, on average, one to five hours a week in co-curricular activities, which is more than students at comparable institutions. Since these activities help students to engage with the campus, can contribute to retention, and give students the opportunity for significant leadership experiences, they are considered important ‘value-added’ components of the CMU student experience.

Examples of some of the many co-curricular activities available to students are:

---

8 academiciansenate.cmich.edu/NonCad/UP_basic_documents_set_1-27-04.pdf
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Student-led organizations: CMU students are actively engaged in student organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternities and sororities, and intercollegiate and intramural sports. There are 25 Greek organizations and 254 other registered student organizations on campus, all of which are led and managed by students. Included here are pre-professional groups that bring students with common career plans together in related activities.

Residence life: Over 95% of CMU students begin their college life in CMU’s residence halls, which offer extensive programming and support services, including academic advising. Residential Colleges exist for students in Health Professions, Science and Technology, Foreign Language, School of Music, School of Business, and Education and Human Services, which provide students with the option of extending their academic interests into their living environment.

Health and fitness: CMU’s Student Activity Center was one of the first recreation facilities of its kind, and over the years has served as a model for many peer institutions. The Office of University Recreation also offers programming relative to healthy lifestyle choices and physical fitness for students. Relative to students at comparable institutions, CMU students report they stay more physically fit during college, which may be attributable to the strong facilities and programming in this area.

Volunteerism: Many CMU students are particularly active as volunteers. In 2004-05, 1,018 CMU students registered with the Volunteer Center, an office that connects campus members with volunteer opportunities in the mid-Michigan area and provides links to national projects. A total of 784 volunteer events took place in Isabella (in which CMU resides), Clare, Midland and Saginaw Counties. Students also are involved in national volunteer projects like America Reads, David Garcia, and Safer Sex Patrol. The Volunteer Center and its student volunteers received recognition by Governor Jennifer Granholm through the Michigan Campus Compact (MCC). Additionally, in 2004, CMU students received MCC’s Outstanding Community Impact Award, the Commitment to Service Award, and the Heart and Soul Award.

Work experiences: Work experiences contribute to some students’ education. Campus jobs allow students to develop communication and organizational skills, and in some cases develop skills directly related to their academic programs (e.g., working the Information Technology Help Desk; assisting faculty with science laboratory classes). Off-campus employment also offers students opportunities for skill development. However, off-campus work generally involves greater time commitments.

10 secure.stulife.cmich.edu/rso/reports/report_orgtype.asp
11 www.reslife.cmich.edu/CommunityLiving/ResidentialColleges/residentialColleges.shtml
12 www.sac.cmich.edu/urec/index.htm
14 stulife.cmich.edu/volunteer/home.shtml
15 www.micampuscompact.org/
and in some instances does not offer much in the way of career-related experiences. Figure 6-4 shows that CMU seniors with off-campus jobs tended to work twice as many hours as those working on-campus. While CMU students did not report spending as much time working as students from other doctoral/research-intensive institutions, it is nonetheless a concern that attention to work may interfere with academic studies.

**Balance:** It is a challenge for CMU students, like it is for many young people, to strike the appropriate balance between all of their co-curricular activities and their coursework. Helping students address this challenge is already a component of first-year student orientation, the First Year Experience Course and Residence Life programming.

**CMU offers professional development opportunities to its faculty and staff**

CMU supports the professional development of its employees in many ways including sabbatical leaves, two professional development units, and internal funds for training. In this way professional development is made available for all faculty and most staff, promoting the acquisition of new techniques and up-to-date information, as well as development of skills for improved university function and personal growth.

**Faculty**

**Sabbaticals:** CMU has generous support for faculty sabbaticals. The *CMU-Faculty Association Agreement* allows for one-semester sabbatical leaves at full pay after every six years of service for tenured faculty. While faculty must apply for their leaves, it is unusual for a request to be denied. Requests are made for projects to improve teaching, engage in research or other creative activities, perform service to the profession, or other professional development activities in accordance with the *CMU-FA Agreement*.

In the past five years, 184 faculty have taken sabbaticals; 91% of these were one-semester leaves. This means that less than 7% of the faculty is on leave in any particular year, and that just over half of eligible faculty take advantage of sabbatical leaves. There is no requirement in the *Agreement* or in departmental bylaws that faculty leave campus, and many choose to remain in Mt. Pleasant, taking shorter trips to research sites or scholarly meetings during the sabbatical semester or year.

**Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching:** The Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching (FaCIT) plays a key role in providing, coordinating and publicizing professional development for CMU on- and off-campus faculty. See description of FaCIT and its activities in Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching, Core Component 3B*. 

**Figure 6-4. Student Time Spent Working (NSSE 2004)**
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Staff

CMU Human Resources established the Professional Development
unit in 2000 to provide professional development and training to CMU
staff. The areas in which training has been offered were identified in
2000 in a campuswide needs analysis, supplemented by additional
contemporary requests. The programs range from lunchtime sessions
for clerical employees to retreats for senior staff, and include such
activities as online workshops and the innovative CMU Stars series.
Table 6-1 shows the types of professional development programs available and the number of attendees between 2000 and 2004.

A program of particular success has been the Supervision Excellence Series. This is for current or aspiring supervisors interested in strengthening their management and leadership skills. Those selected to participate attend a series of eight day-long workshops and engage in between-session activities that further hone their supervisory skills and provide formative feedback from supervisors, coworkers and customers about their performance. At the end of 2003, 31% of CMU supervisors had been certified by this program.

Another good example of training provided through the Professional Development unit occurred in conjunction with employee lay-offs during the last two rounds of budget reductions. Sessions for employees who were to be laid off and their supervisors were proactive, multi-faceted, coordinated, and widely heralded for their effectiveness in helping CMU to create as humane a process as possible.

Unfortunately, funding for staff development activities has been significantly reduced during the budget cutting process. Figure 6-5 shows that the staff training department lost 41% of its budget between 2000 and 2005. Elimination of a director position resulted in an additional loss of $96,917 not reflected in the figure.

The budget reductions have forced a shift in focus from general staff development to programs targeted on specific institutional priorities. For example, strategic planning and performance management were the focus this year, while service and violence prevention were stressed in the previous year. This shift does not enable CMU to address many of the basic development needs of our staff, including pursuit of the plan to develop online learning opportunities for off-campus staff members, leaving many of them without CMU-sponsored developmental opportunities.

As budget cuts have progressed over the last few years, Human Resources has sought to supplement the staff training budget by focusing more and more on the larger community and fee-based training. Funds generated from staff training program fees charged to outside organizations are plowed back into training and development programs for CMU staff. This has become an important source of

Table 6-1. Professional Development
Workshops and Programs, 2000–04,
Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Workshop/ Program</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-requested</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>5361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Series</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-requested</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1548*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coaching</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Community-based, non-CMU participants

Figure 6-5. Reductions in Budget for Staff in Professional Developments

16 www.hrs.cmich.edu/PCD/AboutUs.htm
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revenue, allowing Human Resources to continue to offer such programs as the Supervision Excellence series.

**CMU’s faculty and students are active in scholarship and creating knowledge through basic and applied research**

A significant transition for CMU has been the shift toward greater scholarship activity, which is the subject of Chapter 8, *Special Emphasis* and follows from CMU’s mission to “promote the scholarly pursuit and dissemination of new knowledge, artistic production, and applied research.” Engaged in this transition are both students — graduate and undergraduate — and faculty. For a faculty member, ongoing research or creative activity, usually demonstrated through scholarly publication, indicates continued intellectual growth.

**Students**

*CMU 2010* establishes strengthening the infrastructure for students’ engagement in scholarship with faculty as a priority. We hope to expand the engagement of students in scholarship as described in Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching, Core Component 3B,* to include more students and faculty, and to increase the overall quality of those opportunities and their outcomes.

**Faculty**

Scholarship is an expectation in all academic departments. Faculty members are expected to keep abreast of scholarly advances within their discipline and to pursue creative work. Two of the four areas that form the basis for reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions are (1) the scholarly and creative activity and (2) the professional growth of the faculty member (*CMU-FA Agreement,* Article 14). In most cases fulfillment of this expectation is demonstrated by the publication of books, research papers in peer-reviewed professional journals, and juried performances or exhibitions. In other practice-oriented fields, it can be maintaining licensure or professional practice.

Table 6-2 summarizes faculty publication activity from 2000 to 2004, insofar as such activity was reported to the Faculty Information Database (FID). Since not all faculty are represented in the FID, these numbers are underestimates of the level of faculty scholarship. In the last five years, faculty reported almost 100 books and over 1,200 chapters and peer-reviewed articles. Table 6-3 shows the faculty presentations at national and international conferences, exhibits and performances as reported in the FID. CMU faculty present, exhibit and perform in national and, to a lesser extent, international venues.
Each year there are CMU faculty who receive national and international awards. They receive recognition for their roles as educators, for their scholarly work, and for their service. For example, each year in the most recent past, one or two faculty members have received Fulbright Awards. Others have won national awards, including the 2002 Distinguished Education Service Award presented to Peter Orlik, professor of broadcast and cinematic arts; the 2001 Outstanding Reading Educator Award given to Leonie Rose by the International Reading Association; the Best New Journal Award from the Council of Editors of Learned Journals for Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture awarded to co-Editor Marcia Taylor, professor of English; and the 2003 National Poetry Prize awarded to Mark Yakich, assistant professor of English.
CMU provides the support needed for scholarly activity

In the past five years, CMU has made concerted efforts to maintain and, when possible, to enhance support for scholarly activities. This has included supplying both infrastructure and funding to support research activity.

Infrastructural support has been made in recent building designs to incorporate research space along with the requisite plumbing, ventilation, equipment and electrical/computer resources needed. Examples are the facilities created for students and faculty in chemistry, physics, geography, music, and the health professions. Many of these facilities were planned in conjunction with the purchase of specific equipment and instrumentation to be housed within them. Of concern to these same groups and others is that no funds have been dedicated for managing the eventual replacement of this equipment when it becomes outdated. Replacement of major equipment is a concern for the future that will need to be addressed.

Funding in the form of graduate assistantships provides an important form of financial support that contributes to scholarship at CMU. In 2004-05, CMU had 498 graduate assistants assigned to 35 units. For 2004-05, the total funding contributed to graduate assistants was $4,984,605, of which $3,462,605 was for stipends and the remainder was for tuition reimbursement.

Support for sponsored research

Funding and infrastructural support have bolstered CMU’s external grant activity. The *Strategic Plan for Transforming Research at Central Michigan University* details strategies for increasing annual external funding to $25 million by 2008. The following sections describe a number of the ways in which research in general and external funding in particular are supported.

CMU views externally supported research as increasingly important. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) employs a staff of 2.5 research officers who are available to assist with all aspects of external grant proposal preparation, including development of budgets. Grant writing workshops are offered several times a year for faculty seeking external funding. These serve about 20 people per session, about half of whom submit proposals within a year of the workshop.

ORSP also provides funding directly to faculty through programs designed to support faculty research and pursuit of external funding. These are summarized in Table 6-4.
Table 6-4. Internal Funding for Faculty Research and Creative Endeavors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs that support research generally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faculty Insight Teams (FIT)             | Established in 2005 to support teams of faculty and students, either undergraduate or graduate students, who wish to explore scholarly topics outside the classroom. Maximum $5K per team per year for three years.  
| Faculty Research & Creative Endeavors (FRCE) | Grants for direct costs of scholarly activities, as well as presentation, performance, and publication of scholarly work. Up to $7,500 per individual. These grants also allow for faculty to apply for release time in order to devote more time to a specific project.  
| Research Excellence Funds (REF)         | Major financial support given for basic and applied research and the development of research centers for the “economic and social benefit of the State of Michigan.” Annually about $440,000 has been given to some carefully selected projects, some examples of which are listed on the ORSP Web site. In the past three years (2003-2005) a total of eight faculty have been supported on six research projects and a total of 24 faculty have been supported to create six research centers. The intention in all cases is that the researchers will seek either external contracts or external grants to create successful research foci at CMU.  

Programs that encourage pursuit of external funding

| Grant Development Reimbursement Award | This award covers expenses related to travel (e.g., visit with grant’s officer at a federal office) for developing proposals for external funding. In the past three years, four to six of these have been awarded per year and to date 25 to 30% of these awards have resulted in a funded project within a year.  
| President’s Research Investment Fund (PRIF) | This award supports scholarly activities leading to the submission of a grant proposal to a major external funding agency. Since its inception in 2001, 60 awards have been made to a total of 73 faculty members. The return on investment has been good — approximately $1 million has been invested and over $3 million has been awarded through externally funded proposals prepared by the faculty PRIF awardees.  
| Research Incentive Awards (RIA) | These awards are made to faculty who receive grants over $50,000 that meet certain conditions. Faculty receive summer support equal to what was awarded on their externally funded grant. About four to six RIAs have been awarded each year over the last three years. There has been no specific assessment of the effectiveness of this award in encouraging proposal writing and follow-through.  

Notes:
1 www.orsp.cmich.edu/orspinternal.htm#REF  
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4 www.orsp.cmich.edu/PRIFawards.htm

Overall, the investments and support of faculty have led to increases in grant activity, and these increases are shown in Table 6-5 and Figure 6-6. There have been increases in the number of grants submitted, dollars requested, grants funded and overall dollars awarded. The data represent three-year averages in order to reduce the impact of large grants awarded in single years. Since many awards are for two to three years, a three-year average also reflects quite closely the average research expenditures during the grant period. Totals for 2000–03 and 2001–04 demonstrate significant growth in dollars requested and a modest growth in the number of proposals funded and dollars awarded.
Table 6-5. Proposals Submitted, Grants Awarded, Funds Requested and Dollars Awarded 1997–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Submissions</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars Requested</td>
<td>$26,825,737</td>
<td>$32,079,916</td>
<td>$32,511,527</td>
<td>$38,832,309</td>
<td>$44,733,887</td>
<td>$50,223,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Awarded</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars Awarded</td>
<td>$7,537,287</td>
<td>$9,513,585</td>
<td>$9,076,816</td>
<td>$10,392,680</td>
<td>$11,222,086</td>
<td>$12,551,247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the 2004-2005 fiscal year, Michigan Schools in the Middle (MSIM) reported for the first time their small contract activity below CMU’s $1,200 contracting threshold, which accounts for 103 submitted and funded projects, valued at $101,843.10. Without the MSIM contracts, the number of proposals submitted and dollars requested would have increased by 3% and 4%, respectively, over the average number for the previous three years. The number of grants and contracts funded and dollars awarded would have increased over the average of the previous three-year period by 5%* and 20%, respectively.

Figure 6-6. Proportion of Federal Expenditures as a Total of All Grants and Contracts 1996-2005 (Three Year Averages)

It has been encouraging to see increases both in the amount of money and in the percentage of funding coming to CMU from federal sources, as shown in Figure 6-6. This has resulted in increased revenue from indirect costs, shown in Figure 6-7. Nevertheless, despite the clear evidence of progress, CMU ranked close to the bottom among its benchmarks in terms of external grant dollars awarded the last time CMU collected these comparison figures (Figure 6-8).
Internal funding to support scholarly activity

CMU faculty and students have opportunities to participate in a wide range of internal grant programs. ORSP programs for faculty are described in Table 6-4. Programs for students are summarized in Table 6-6. Total expenditures for these activities were under $2 million for both 2002-03 and 2003-04. This is somewhat less than in 2001-02, when expenditures totaled $2.3 million. Overall funding however, while significant, is still small compared to our benchmark institutions, as shown in Figure 6-9.

Research centers

An area of strength is CMU’s number of specialized research centers and institutes that bring together scholars who have common foci. Consistent with CMU’s traditions, all centers have both a teaching and research focus. Table 6-7 provides a representative list.

---
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Table 6-7. CMU Research Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMU Biological Station</td>
<td>Located on Beaver Island in northern Lake Michigan, this tract of land serves a variety of field courses offered at the station by providing a highly diverse site for field trips, research and other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Applied Research and Rural Studies (CARRS)</td>
<td>CARRS was created to address needs in rural Michigan. The Center utilizes the resources and academic expertise of CMU to assist social agencies, governmental units and non-profit organizations that require guidance in order to address social, economic, environmental and community development concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Geographic Information Science</td>
<td>Established to facilitate and handle the rapidly increasing amounts of spatially referenced data for central and northern Michigan, this center serves internal as well as external groups. Data collected are being used for application projects, research, and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaBelle Entrepreneurial Center</td>
<td>This center is devoted to synergistically uniting CMU students and faculty, current and potential small business owners and other business educators in central and northern Michigan, in a learning partnership for the mutual benefit of all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Water Research Center</td>
<td>This center represents a collaboration of faculty and research laboratories at CMU. The center’s services include collection and analysis of surface, groundwater, and finished water samples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineering &amp; Information Technology Institute</td>
<td>This institute was established as an international cooperative research, development and teaching organization. It represents a partnership between CMU and industrial, academic, and governmental organizations involved in the software engineering and information technology fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Research and Integrative Neuroscience (BRAIN) Center</td>
<td>This center is currently researching effective pharmaceutical interventions for neurodegenerative diseases such as Huntington’s and Parkinson’s disease, as well as lead toxicity in children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Computer Vision</td>
<td>This group conducts research in computer vision and robotics and develops software in object recognition using techniques of image processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>This center conducts research and assesses the status of Supply Chain Management in manufacturing companies, using an integrated systems view of supply chain issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Professional and Personal Ethics</td>
<td>This center promotes campus reflection on moral situations through its sponsorship of films, speakers, debates, and other events on the CMU campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support for collaborative research

CMU supports a number of collaborative ventures with external bodies, all of which provide opportunities for faculty, staff and students to engage in scholarly work. A few highlights are:

- A large applied research initiative, created jointly by CMU and the city of Mt. Pleasant in 2002, is known as the Central Michigan University Center for Applied Research and Technology (CART). This partnership is one of Michigan’s eleven SmartZones — business centers created by the Michigan Economic Development Corporation to foster collaboration between businesses, communities and institutions of higher education. Today, the largest company in CART is Dendritic Nanotechnologies, Inc., which has initiated extensive collaborative work among its staff and CMU faculty from chemistry, physics
and mathematics as they develop new knowledge that is expected
to fuel future scientific and business advancements. It is expected
that more businesses will join CART, providing even more areas of
opportunity.

- CMU works in partnership with SAP America, a company devoted
to developing enterprise software. Through the CMU-SAP
  University Alliance Program, SAP America has donated software, a
  simulation training database, and technical support valued at $1.1
  million to the university. CMU faculty and students collaborate
  with SAP in researching new and improved software methods,
  applications and their efficacies.

- CMU’s Michigan Schools in the Middle program works in
  collaboration with Michigan public school teachers and
  administrators in designing, developing and implementing effective
  middle-level teacher professional development programs. This
  entity is self-supporting as a consequence of its active pursuit of
  external grant funding.

- CMU leads the Rural Telehealth and Community Education
  Network, which provides health information services, educational
  activities and health informatics applications designed to improve
  access, efficiency, and quality of health care information and
  services in targeted underserved rural communities. This project
  is supported by a grant from the Office for the Advancement of
  Telehealth in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

- CMU acquired a 3D Human Body Scanner, of which there are
  only eight in the U.S., with a grant from the National Science
  Foundation. The scanner has spawned collaborative research with
  industry partners like Malden Mills, Brooks Brothers, Reebok and
  the Lansing Michigan Hazmet Team.

Other support for scholarly activity

The academic colleges also provide support for research. Smaller
amounts of funding are available for supplies, travel, and other research
expenses. In some instances, colleges are also able to support reduced
teaching loads for faculty engaged in major projects. The need for
adequate time for scholarly activity is widely acknowledged as an issue
needing attention; this is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8, Special
Emphasis.

A significant source of support of scholarship by the colleges and their
departments comes through the funding of graduate assistantships.
A number of assistantships are dedicated solely to research, although
most carry teaching responsibilities. However, in most departments,
the teaching assistants also contribute significantly to the research
underway and so are important sources of support for scholarly activity.
CMU aspires to offer more full-time graduate assistantships, with
compensation comparable to that at benchmark institutions.
CMU recognizes the scholarly and creative achievements of students and faculty

CMU values the scholarly and creative activities of its members and demonstrates its support through public recognition of student and faculty achievements. The following are some examples:

- CMU research and creative activities receive campus attention through two annual events:
  - The Student Research and Creative Endeavors Exhibition (SRCEE) features student performances and poster presentations of their research. The best posters are selected for display at the Michigan State Capitol.
  - The Faculty Excellence Exhibition showcases faculty and staff research projects, typically in the form of posters and demonstrations.
- Since 1995, CMU has selected two senior, tenured faculty to receive the President’s Award for Outstanding Research and Creative Activity. A second award, the Provost’s Award for Outstanding Research and Creative Activity, recognizes two faculty who have more recently obtained their terminal degree. Recipients receive public recognition and a cash award for use in continuing their scholarly activities.
- CMU’s Web home page always features at least one example of scholarly work underway at CMU.
- The Spotlight, a newsletter put out by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, informs the campus of grant awards made to university members.
- Selected research activities are the focus of articles in the alumni magazine, CentraLight. These activities are also featured in interviews and programs broadcast through the university’s public broadcasting affiliate (WCMU), presentations to the Board of Trustees, and press releases to local media.
- Books and articles authored by CMU faculty are displayed on campus; these include mounted wall displays on the main floor of the library and a variety of bound and mounted displays in reception areas of administrative offices.
- CMU has a Faculty Information Database (FID), which archives faculty scholarly activities, research and teaching interests, work with students and other information essential for accreditation and similar processes. Prior to this, there was no centralized reporting of the work of faculty and this has handicapped the institution in understanding itself, in building strategic partnerships internally and externally, and in recognizing the accomplishments of faculty and students. Today, reports can be easily generated and the
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information used to reinforce, expand and recognize the work that is being accomplished.

**CMU supports freedom of inquiry**

CMU firmly endorses academic freedom. CMU has affirmed as its own policy the American Association of University Professors and the American Association of Colleges 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments.²⁸

The Academic Senate maintains a committee charged with considering issues of academic freedom. For most of the past ten years, the Academic Freedom Committee was a standing committee; however because no issues had been referred to it since 1996 — and that was a minor issue — the committee recommended, and the senate approved in February 2005, that this become an ad hoc committee that would be called into session as needed by the Executive Board of the Academic Senate.

Similarly, Article 14 of the CMU-FA Agreement²⁹ makes clear the importance of continuing pursuit of knowledge and learning. It states that faculty peers are in the best position to evaluate the worth of such activities and that their evaluations form a portion of tenure and promotion recommendations. When recommendations are forwarded to the Board of Trustees, they are accompanied by the AAUP statement on academic freedom.

**EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 4A**

CMU is a university in transition, and many of the specifics of that transition fall under this core component as CMU places greater emphasis on creating and applying knowledge. Dramatic improvements have been made in order to enrich the opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to pursue a life of learning.

As shown in this section, CMU provides extensive, engaging events programming and co-curricular activities. It has invested in faculty and staff professional development, and is building a substantive infrastructure to support the planned increases in the research and creative activity of faculty. Progress in all of these areas was noted. Yet, the budget cuts of 2002 and 2003 impacted faculty and staff professional development heavily and have significantly reduced our capacity to offer professional development for CMU staff and faculty.

---

²⁸ www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/1940stat.htm
²⁹ www.fps.cmich.edu/documents/contract.pdf
CORE COMPONENT 4B
The organization demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.

Since its origins, CMU has strived to provide students with an understanding of where their chosen major field of study fits into the whole and how other disciplines and cultures create, use, and value knowledge. CMU has also historically viewed writing, speaking, and quantitative skills as essential foundations of the education it provides.

CMU’s general education program is the foundation and central mechanism through which CMU provides its students a breadth of knowledge and skills that will aid them in pursuit of their life at CMU and after they graduate. This concern for effective general education at CMU has caused much discussion and debate over the past decade. The result has been two recent initiatives. First, the nature of the general education program and its governance structure are now being seriously reviewed for the first time in thirty years. Second, assessment of student learning within general education is receiving attention, and starting to inform instructional and curricular improvements.

This section focuses on CMU’s general education program, which provides a breadth of knowledge. The exercise of intellectual inquiry is also a fundamental part of CMU’s educational programs. This is best demonstrated through the scholarly activities of students and faculty, which have been discussed in the previous section.

CMU’S GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
CMU’s general education program has two components: the Competency Requirements and the University Program (UP) (see Figure 6-10). The Competency Requirements are that students must demonstrate ability in mathematics, speech, and writing at a specified level. This is most commonly demonstrated by passing a course in the area with a grade of C or better. The UP consists of over 270 courses divided into three groups that represent the basic areas of human knowledge — humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences — and a fourth group — integrative and area studies — of courses that generally build upon the other three groups. Students must take a minimum of 30 hours, selecting and satisfactorily completing at least 3 hours within each subgroup of the four UP groups. In general, courses chosen must be from different departments. Noteworthy relative to CMU’s mission to prepare students for life and work in diverse and global environments is the requirement that students take three semester hours of coursework in each of the following: integrative studies, global culture and U.S. racism and cultural diversity. Students who wish to study overseas may apply to have that coursework included as UP credit. Both the University
Program and the Competency Requirements are described in detail in *The University Program: A Basic Documents Set.*

A key objective behind the UP is to introduce students to “the content and methods of major fields of human knowledge.” The groups and subgroups blend discipline-based knowledge and methods. The selection of the courses to be in the UP is to be based on three propositions - coherence, representativeness, and completeness — with the hope that “a student understands not only the guiding principles of a course taken; not only how that course, and that principle, fit into the larger picture of human knowledge; but also, from the UP courses taken collectively, what that larger picture looks like.”

Each course in the UP is to emphasize the techniques common to that discipline and the characteristic value premises and the limitations.
of that discipline’s approach. As further stated in The University Program: A Basic Document Set, “the objective of a general education is presumably not merely to convey a body of subject matter, but also to equip a student with the conceptual tools to place the information he or she gathers during a lifetime into a meaningful perspective.”

CMU’s general education program has remained relatively unchanged over the past ten years. In 2003 the Academic Senate asked that UP instructors include a requirement that students attend “at least one out-of-class university event and provide a report or reflection on that experience as one component of their grade.” Smaller changes, such as the addition of courses as proposed by individual departments, have also been made.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

**CMU’s general education program has features that help foster its goals**

CMU views writing, speaking, and quantitative skills as essential foundations of a general education, as well as lifelong learning. These foundations are built through the competency requirements and further developed in each course in the UP, which must “require a significant amount of meaningful writing” or have an equivalent amount of computation or public speaking. This “Writing across the University Program” (WAUP) requirement means that within any UP course, over 50% of a student’s course grade must be based on evaluations of their written work, quantitative work, or oral communications.

Another aspect of CMU’s UP is that, with few exceptions, “only persons with faculty rank” are allowed to deliver instruction and assign grades for UP courses. Table 6-8 shows the distribution by faculty status of instructors of general education courses in the various UP groups and competency areas based on the instructor of record on file in the Registrar’s Office. The data show that only in UP courses within Group II-B, Quantitative & Mathematical Sciences, are there significant numbers of graduate students providing instruction. Even so, the percentage of courses taught by graduate students is less than 10%, and most of these are laboratory classes. Graduate students teach more than 40% of the written English competency and a smaller percentage of the mathematics and oral English competency sections, although those numbers are rising. Worthy of note, too, is that most UP courses...
are taught by tenure-track faculty; only in the arts, behavioral sciences, global cultures, and racism and diversity groups are over half the sections staffed by temporary faculty.

Finally, while a few general education courses have large enrollments (over 100), most do not. Table 6-9 shows the average class sizes for general education courses over the past few years. Only in Subgroups I-B and III-A are the averages greater than 55 students.

**CMU has faculty-based governance and review of general education**

The General Education Coordinator plays a key leadership role in the coordination of the general education program. This is a half-time faculty release position.

Two standing committees of the Academic Senate govern general education:

1. **General Education Council**\(^33\): charged with general oversight, including review of the program and assessment of student learning.

2. **General Education Subcommittee of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**\(^34\): charged with review of curricular recommendations related to general education and with monitoring the extent to which courses comply with the UP requirements, such as the writing requirement. In practice, this committee reviews all UP courses on a five-year cycle.

In the past few years, two groups have worked on review of the general education program. The first, the General Education Task Force, was established in 2002. Its purpose was to investigate problems associated with general education program governance, assessment of the Writing across the University Program, and procedures for general education revision (with special attention paid to potential impediments to revision efforts).\(^35\) In its final report, \(^36\) submitted to the Senate Executive Board on May 9, 2003, it was noted that, “There is little agreement among Task Force members about the types and extent of problems that plague the General Education Program.” The task force did identify a number of issues needing attention, which are summarized in Table 6-10, and then made the following overall recommendation:

“The university should implement changes in the system of governance (especially with respect to the charge of the General Education Council) and begin the process of revising the University Program and the Writing across the University Program. The Task Force recommends that the revision effort begin in the Fall 2003 with the formation of a new General Education Task Force.”

---

\(^33\) academicsenate.cmich.edu/Committees/genedcncl.pdf
\(^34\) academicsenate.cmich.edu/Committees/genedsub.pdf
\(^35\) academicsenate.cmich.edu/current events/Task_Force_Charge1.doc
\(^36\) www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/gened/Task_Force_Report1.pdf
Table 6-8. General Education Sections Taught by Various Instructor Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Tenured/Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Graduate Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP I-A. Human Events and Ideas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP I-B. The Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP II-A. Descriptive Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP II-B. Quantitative &amp; Mathematical Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP III-A. Behavioral Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP III-B. Studies in Social Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP IV-A. Integrative &amp; Multi-disciplinary Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP IV-B. Studies in Global Cultures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP IV-C. Studies in Racism &amp; Cultural Diversity in the US</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman Written English Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Written English Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral English Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instructor status is based on the Instructor of Record on file with the Registrar’s Office. In a few instances, particularly for laboratory courses, this may be a faculty member who is supervising graduate teaching assistants.
The General Education Task Force’s report led the Academic Senate to form the General Education Steering Committee\(^ {37} \) to continue study and evaluation of general education at CMU. The steering committee conducted online surveys of students, faculty and staff, and a telephone survey of alumni during 2004-05, summaries of which are available on the Web.\(^ {38} \) The committee plans to conduct open forums for students and all academic colleges to discuss the results of the surveys in Fall 2005 and submit its recommendations to the Senate Executive Board by Spring 2006. Regarding the other recommendations of the task force, the faculty who teach composition are developing a response to the call for changes in the WAUP, but there has yet to be any action on revising the charge to the General Education Council.

The efforts of the task force and the steering committee mark the first significant comprehensive review of CMU’s general education program since its inception in the 1970s. The issue of general education reform will likely be a major focus of CMU students, faculty, and administrators over the next few years.

### Table 6-10. Areas of General Education Needing Attention According to 2002-03 Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Committees regularly review CMU’s general education program but the effectiveness of individual committees and the rationale for so many committees is questioned. It has also been a challenge to populate these committees and to maintain leadership in important roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The charge of the General Education Council simply is not realistic, requiring far more time and expertise than should be expected of its members. Requests for funding must go to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs or to the Assessment Council for costs associated with its assessment activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Focus</td>
<td>Many Task Force members, though not all, believed the UP lacks adequate focus and coherence to be truly effective. This lack of agreement about the underlying purpose of the UP is a strong indication of the need for further, expanded discussion of this issue among all stakeholders, but especially among CMU faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with WAUP</td>
<td>Most Task Force members believed that in addition to being a burden on faculty teaching UP courses with high course caps, the WAUP also lacks focus and clear purpose, is difficult to implement and assess (due to the large number of courses in the UP), and lacks sufficient administrative support. At the same time, most Task Force members believed there should be some kind of writing-across-the-curriculum program and efforts to foster a “culture of writing” as a way of helping students become competent writers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>The Task Force also found that one impediment to any revision of the UP and the WAUP is the fact that many colleges and departments have come to rely on University Program courses for their economic welfare: faculty are acutely aware that tuition revenue from UP courses funds both undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Thus, there is no economic incentive to reduce the number of UP courses or a set of interdisciplinary core general education courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Revision of the Program</td>
<td>There was little agreement among Task Force members about the types and extent of problems that plague the General Education Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^ {37} \) [www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/vp/gened/GenEdComittee.pdf](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/vp/gened/GenEdComittee.pdf)

\(^ {38} \) [www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/vp/gened/gened.htm](http://www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/vp/gened/gened.htm)
CMU assesses student learning within the general education program

Assessment of whether the learning objectives of the general education program are being achieved has been ongoing, although not in as systematic a way as one would like. The most informative data is for the mathematics and writing competencies and a few subgroups the UP.

Assessments of course learning objectives

The learning outcomes for the individual courses in the general education program are developed, as are the objectives for all courses, by the departments that offer them. The objectives are specified in the master course syllabi and assessment is by the departments or their subunits.

Assessments of mathematics competency

To evaluate the effectiveness of the mathematics competency requirement, the Department of Mathematics conducted studies using both student opinion surveys and outcomes assessments. Pre-test/post-test assessments since 1995 indicate that a statistically significant improvement in student knowledge occurs during the basic competency course; however, student surveys reveal that a high percentage of students ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ that the class material is mostly review of what they learned in high school.39

This finding as well as discovery that CMU had one of the lowest mathematics competency requirements in the state led the mathematics department to propose that the minimum level for demonstrating mathematics competency be increased. The Academic Senate approved a new level in Spring 2005 with implementation planned for the Fall semester.

Assessments of writing competency

Three major assessments of students’ writing have been carried out since our previous accreditation review;40 a fourth is currently in progress. These are:

- A Writing Competency Assessment, in 1997, utilized a student opinion survey, a focus group, and samples of student writing. Results suggested that while the majority of students (61-75%) were competent or outstanding writers, 25–39% failed to meet standards of competency. However, this study suffered from several methodological problems that have limited confidence in the results.

- Two faculty opinion surveys, in 1999 and 2002, measured perceptions of faculty with regard to CMU’s writing competency requirement and the WAUP, as well as the general quality of student writing. The surveys revealed that (1) faculty generally
support the WAUP concept, but class sections with large enrollments lead to lack of full compliance with the writing policy, (2) a number of faculty are actively trying to help students become effective writers, and they employ a variety of strategies for doing so, (3) CMU faculty assign relatively few and short writing assignments in just a few genres, even though they expect that, upon graduation, students should be able to write in a wide variety of discipline-specific genres, and (4) most faculty perceived that students’ use of grammar, punctuation, and spelling were not areas of concern, with the main weaknesses in student writing being lack of organization and lack of substantiation for claims and arguments.

- In February 2004, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) instrument, the Academic Profile® Assessment of General Education Knowledge, was administered to approximately 300 students, 80% of whom were seniors. The results from the writing portion of the exam are shown in Table 6-11. ETS scorers placed 52.1% of the essays into the two lowest categories, scores of 1 or 2 on a four-point scale; CMU scorers placed 77.6% of essays into the two lowest categories. These data indicate that, in terms of the quality of their writing, CMU students demonstrate only very basic knowledge. Some factors other than lack of writing ability that may partially account for CMU students’ overall poor performance on the essay are discussed in the final report.41

- A larger study of student writing at CMU is currently being conducted by the composition faculty. It consists of pre- and post-tests of all students enrolled during Spring 2005 in writing competency courses (i.e., ENG 101, 103, and 201). Post-tests were to be administered at the end of the semester and analyzed during summer 2005.

CMU also conducts annual surveys of students that ask questions about their educational experiences, including items relevant to the UP and competencies. For example, on the NSSE, fewer CMU students than students at other doctoral/research-intensive universities reported themselves as capable of writing clearly and effectively. On the other hand, CMU students report they spend about as much time writing as students at comparable institutions, and they also indicate they are more likely to ask others to read their writing, refer to a style manual, and ask for advice when writing a paper, each of which is considered an important skill for lifelong learning.

Clearly, further development of students’ writing skills is needed and valued by the campus. The English department has responded by revising the two competency courses. Services of the Writing Center will be expanded in Fall 2005, as planned in CMU 2010. The proposal for changes in the writing across the curriculum policy will be discussed by the campus in 2005-06.

---

41 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/gened/AP Exam and Essays.pdf
Assessments of public speaking competency

Little assessment has been done in this area. There are the opinions provided by students on the NSSE that, to a greater extent than students at other doctoral/research-intensive universities CMU students feel their coursework helped them speak clearly and effectively.

University program assessments

Although not as thorough as the assessment of the mathematics and writing competencies, significant effort has been devoted to assessing particular University Program groups and subgroups. The Final Report of an Assessment of Subgroup 4B: Studies in Global Cultures recommended that “the General Education Council should strive to improve its assessment initiatives by conducting more comprehensive and long-term projects.”

CMU launched such an initiative in 2004 with the administration of the Academic Profile® Assessment of General Education Knowledge (APT) exam, mentioned under assessments of writing, to 300 students, mostly seniors. This was CMU’s first attempt to directly assess students’ broad general education knowledge and skills. The main findings were:

- CMU scores were nearly identical to those at the 14 other doctoral/research-intensive universities whose students took the APT. This suggests that CMU students have about the same level of general knowledge as do students at comparable institutions. The exceptions were for Reading, Level 2, where a substantially smaller proportion of CMU students than the comparison group scored in the proficient category (33% vs. 43%).

- The scores in critical thinking, reading comprehension, and mathematics indicate that CMU students are proficient only at the lowest levels, the levels one might find appropriate for incoming freshmen or first-semester sophomores. Because 80% of the exam participants were graduating seniors and another 15% were second-semester juniors, these data are alarming.

In terms of indirect measures of student outcomes from CMU’s general education program, we find CMU student perceptions are quite positive. For example, annual surveys of students typically have shown that approximately 80% of CMU seniors report feeling they are receiving a broad general education (see Figure 6-11). These satisfaction levels are comparable to those reported by students attending similar institutions. They also are consistent with reports from many (63%) CMU faculty who say that they emphasize (quite a bit or very much) students’ acquisition of a broad general education.

44 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), 2003 (available in Resource Room).
On the other hand, compared to students at other doctoral/research-intensive institutions, CMU first-year students who typically are taking largely general education coursework, are more likely to report that their general education coursework tended not to focus on analyzing ideas, synthesizing ideas, and applying theories and concepts to practical problems. Instead, they report being asked to memorize more than students at other institutions. This deficiency is being addressed through CMU’s efforts to raise academic standards, including the rigor of general education classes.

Surveys of CMU alumni reflect patterns similar to that shown by our resident students:

- In a 1995 alumni survey, respondents reported that the general education program had had a positive effect on them, and that their communication skills and abilities to see things from different perspectives had improved. Over half reported gaining an appreciation of literature and the arts, an ability to understand quantitative material and an understanding of the sciences and of themselves.

- In a 2005 alumni survey of those who graduated between 1985 and 2003, 64% recognized the positive effect the general education program has had on various aspects of their lives, most notably their ability to communicate in writing (84%) and in speech (84%), their ability to understand social life (88%), and their ability to look at an issue from a variety of different perspectives (86%). When asked to what extent CMU met their expectations, 58% reported “to a great extent.” Over half reported their education to be challenging with less than 2% indicating “not at all challenging.” Additionally, the majority of alumni felt their CMU education helped them get a job (64%) and perform well on the job (69%).

**Plans for future assessments**

CMU recognizes that it presently has limited knowledge about what our students are actually learning through the University Program. This limitation stems in part from a lack of clearly articulated learning outcomes for the UP. Although all master syllabi for University Program courses include student-centered, measurable learning outcomes, only recently has the General Education Council worked to establish official learning objectives for subgroups of the UP. Learning outcomes for all subgroups have now been identified and will be reviewed by the Academic Senate in Fall 2005.

The General Education Council worked over the past two years to lay the foundation for improved assessment, developing proposed learning outcomes for the subgroups and preparing a Five-Year Assessment Plan for general education. The plan has been approved by CMU’s Assessment Council and contains the following schedule for assessments:

---

46 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/gened/FiveYearAssessmentPlan.pdf
• 2005–2006: Oral communication/public speaking
• 2006–2007: Library research skills
• 2007–2008: Quantitative reasoning and interpretation, and University Program

Responding to the identified need for expanded assessment of the broad outcomes of a CMU education, including general education, CMU applied and was selected to be among 50 institutions that will be part of a four-year national longitudinal study that will assess key learning outcomes of a college education. During each year of the study, a sample of CMU’s first-, third- and fourth-year students will take tests measuring their writing, critical thinking and numerical reasoning. First-year students’ scores will be tracked over four years in an examination of the evolution of their learning and the ‘value-added’ by their various educational experiences.

CMU recognizes a need to address present shortcomings in its general education program

There is a growing feeling on campus that changes are needed in CMU’s general education program. This stems from the discussions of general education that have taken place in the Academic Senate and several of its standing committees and from the work of the two committees charged with reviewing general education, including the all-campus survey. Some of the topics that have been debated are evidence of student learning, students’ need for a rich and modern liberal education, different models for general education and exemplary programs at other institutions.

CMU students score about average on a number of direct measures of their learning in the general education program, but learning at this level does not meet the standards CMU desires. This is particularly true in basic writing, mathematics and critical thinking. Some feel the growth in the number of courses in the program has diminished its cohesiveness. Despite the many changes in the world and expectations for graduates since the program was developed, it has not been seriously examined in light of these changes. Over the years there have been significant assessment efforts initiated by the program’s leadership, but transitions in key positions have prevented sustained efforts and undermined the utilization of the data collected. Institutional support for assessment efforts was weak until 2000.

Efforts are presently underway to address these shortcomings. It is recognized that both institutional support and sustained faculty engagement are essential if progress is to be made, especially toward the critical need to making effective assessment a working part of the general education program. There have been some steps forward, but progress has been slow — so slow that there is a risk that changes of any substance will not occur.
EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 4B

CMU’s general education program is currently under review. There is widespread agreement that there is a need to critically evaluate the program’s content as well as its governance. Within the General Education Steering Committee, the most serious discussions on the need for change and what change might look like have yet to occur. For a number of reasons, there exists a certain level of inertia and resistance to change. Building a campus consensus to make needed changes would be difficult. At least one area of progress can be cited — the increased competency standards for both mathematics and writing.

In terms of governance, it has been concluded that the committee overseeing assessment of general education, the General Education Council, has been working under a charge that is not reasonable, requiring far more time and expertise than can reasonably be expected of its members.

The limited knowledge we have about what students are actually learning in CMU’s general education program suggests in many areas their knowledge is largely comparable to students at similar institutions. However, it is also true the level of performance on these and other dimensions like reading comprehension, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and writing are below the standards CMU faculty would like to see achieved. Efforts are already underway to address these shortcomings. Ongoing attention and encouragement of these efforts by the academic community will be critical to their success.

CORE COMPONENT 4C

The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

In its past, CMU served its mission well by preparing its students for the needs and demands of the central Michigan region. Today, CMU recognizes the impact of a global society that adapts new technologies as rapidly as it discards old ones. To ensure that its students receive the knowledge and skills needed to live in this changing environment, CMU’s undergraduate and graduate programs are designed to provide the requisite background and practice.

Building on their general education foundation, undergraduate students acquire a basic level of understanding within their major area of study. At the graduate level, students are expected to deepen their understanding of their chosen discipline. CMU commits to offering the programs that make this possible, as shown by two of its institutional goals:

Goal 2: Offer in-depth undergraduate programs in which students can begin to master an academic field and practice a profession.
Goal 3: Offer graduate programs in niche areas of faculty strength that meet regional, state, national and international needs.

*CMU 2010* asserts institutional commitments to preparing students for the 21st century. The second priority within that plan commits CMU to (1) provide educational experiences and programs that enhance diversity and a global perspective, (2) increase the diversity of its faculty, students and staff, and (3) expand programming and integrate into the curriculum topics related to diversity and global perspectives.

In this section we focus on how CMU maintains currency and relevance in its programs so that students gain the knowledge, skills and values necessary for life as citizens and professionals. How CMU ensures students’ technological preparation is covered Core Component 3D in Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching*.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

*CMU uses review processes to maintain currency and quality in its academic programs*

A number of review mechanisms, both internal and external, are used to keep CMU’s programs viable and effective. New programs are created, less relevant ones phased out, and those that are ongoing are modified as student and societal needs change. Master course syllabi are updated on a five-year cycle while academic programs go through formal review on a seven-year cycle following guidelines developed by the Academic Planning Council (see Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching*, Core Component 3A). As part of program review, external reviewers interact with a program’s faculty and students and review curricula and outcomes in evaluating a program’s quality, relevance and currency. A common theme in recent curricular changes is to offer and update courses and programs in ways that better prepare students for a global, diverse, and technological society.

*CMU gathers external feedback on the quality of its academic programs*

CMU recognizes that there is much to be learned from external stakeholders. For this reason CMU maintains ties with its external constituencies and CMU faculty seek to stay abreast within their fields. CMU is open to constructive feedback, and engages many external groups and individuals as it evaluates the quality of programs, operations, and plans for the future. A number of examples are given in the following paragraphs.

All CMU colleges have external advisory boards that meet regularly and provide an important link between CMU faculty and those working in
the field. Advisory boards have played an important role in identifying societal needs for particular skills and specializations among graduates, as well as sometimes providing direct feedback to students. For instance, seniors in the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) program present their senior projects to the College of Business Administration’s Advisory Board. The board then provides evaluative feedback to both the students and to the college.

External input is received in some programs by sponsoring student involvement in competitions judged by industry professionals. These competitions provide important information on students’ abilities to perform challenging tasks in high pressure situations, often working in teams. They also give an indication of CMU student performance relative to that of students from other institutions. Examples of recent competitions in which CMU students were recognized include the SAE Vehicle Design competition, the annual National Geographic Cartography competition, the International Trombone Festival, the Safety Product Student Design Challenge, the National Collegiate Honors Council student of the year and newsletter competitions, Region 2 Student Production Competition from the National Broadcasting Society, and the Third GOES-R Users Conference.

Supervisors of CMU interns and student teachers provide useful feedback on student ability to apply skills learned in the classroom in a professional setting. Feedback regarding student interns’ performance goes directly to the sponsoring departments. The performance of student teachers is reviewed on-site by both teacher education faculty members and content area specialists. Those coordinating the student teaching experience for CMU also survey student teachers, their faculty supervisors, and the teachers and administrators in the schools to which the student teachers are assigned. Table 6-12 includes some of these results. CMU’s student teachers score well. Furthermore, school principals and district administrators have consistently rated CMU’s student teachers as being “very desirable” for employment as classroom teachers. Survey results are shared within the College of Education, the Professional Education Unit, and the academic departments connected with teacher preparation; there are currently initiatives underway to make the latter dissemination of information more systematic.

Information collected directly from current students, from graduates, and from employers of graduates is also used to improve programs. Across campus, departments vary greatly in their efforts to make such contacts; few collect this information on a regular cycle, and improved tracking of and information exchange with graduates is needed. In fact, following a recent audit carried out by the Michigan legislature’s Office of the Auditor General, the auditors recommended that CMU seek even more feedback from graduates, employers of graduates, and businesses. Some departments and programs that are very active in collecting and using such information could be used as models for others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-12. Student Teacher Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals and administrators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Master of Science in Administration (MSA), CMU’s largest graduate program and offered mainly off-campus, is a good example of a unit that collects and uses information from its students and graduates.48

- In a recent survey of 1,039 of its alumni, MSA graduates reported they felt weak in the applications of marketing and finance; this led to the decision to enhance discipline applications within all ProfEd courses.

- The MSA 661 course, *Diversity in the Workplace*, was added to the curriculum after feedback from faculty members, program administrators, and advisors indicated a need in this area.

- MSA Concentrations in Acquisitions Administration and Long-Term Care Administration were added after students and external groups expressed these were area of need.

- An interesting finding related to the marketing of the MSA program concerned the motivation of its adult learners. These students are mainly interested in completing their degree, and are secondarily motivated by factors such as convenience, flexibility, and program options. Surprisingly, program cost was not an important factor.

**CMU prepares students with knowledge and skills for successful careers**

To be prepared for their careers, students need to be familiar with the fundamental concepts of their major disciplines, along with the analytical methods used in the field. Equally important, given the rapid rate of change in today’s world, is preparation to synthesize new knowledge and adapt to new ways of working. In its undergraduate and graduate programs, CMU seeks to provide the requisite preparation in all these areas.

**Undergraduate programs**

Courses within majors are designed so that students will become familiar with the basic knowledge and methods of analysis used within that discipline. Research methods courses are common in many undergraduate majors. These courses allow students to learn how to synthesize new knowledge and apply the skills learned from their basic courses. Three examples are: HST 301 *The Craft of History*, MKT 450 *Marketing Research*, ART 361 4-D Installation, Performance, and Environmental Sculpture, and BIO 403 *Undergraduate Research*.

Capstone courses in students’ majors also help undergraduates to integrate and synthesize their knowledge and hone skill prior to leaving CMU. In 1999 the Academic Senate discussed having this as a requirement for all majors. While this is not yet mandatory, many programs do have capstone experiences, including many of CMU’s

---

48 [www.cel.cmich.edu/faculty/org-research.html](http://www.cel.cmich.edu/faculty/org-research.html)
largest programs such as teacher education, business, integrative public relations, psychology and recreation.

In opinion surveys, the majority of CMU students report feeling that they are acquiring job and work-related knowledge and skills in their CMU education (Figure 6.12). These reactions are comparable to those reported by students at similar institutions. They also are consistent with reports given by CMU faculty, 62% of whom say that they emphasize (quite a bit or very much) job or work-related knowledge and skills in their classes. 49 For alumni, the majority feel that their CMU education did help them to get a job (64%) and to perform well on the job (69%). 50

Graduate programs

At CMU, graduate students represent approximately 9% of the on-campus student population and 76% of off-campus students. Although undergraduate education is clearly CMU’s central focus, graduate education is an increasingly important area. On campus, graduate programs are viewed as contributing to intellectually richer undergraduate experiences, to the institution’s research activities, and to our ability to attract top faculty.

CMU adheres to the philosophy that the purpose of graduate education is to develop students’ analytical and creative thinking capabilities as they pursue intensive study within a particular field. To this end, all CMU’s programs require that students engage in scholarly work under the guidance of faculty members, the form of which depends on the nature of the discipline they are studying. This work is formalized through capstone experiences such as theses, dissertations, research projects, practicum reviews, product presentations, examinations, or oral defenses.

CMU’s success in achieving its objectives for graduate education is largely evaluated at the program level. In all cases, faculty assess students’ work to determine the level of mastery and achievement, as well as the overall quality of the academic program. There is considerable variation in the rigor and thoroughness with which these assessments of student work are carried out. It has been suggested that more graduate programs should require that students write a thesis or dissertation. Presently, only about 13% of the on-campus master’s degree recipients complete theses. This low number is partly due to the fact that (using 2003-04 data) 33% of the master’s degrees were awarded in professional degree programs — PT, PA, MBA, and counseling — in which theses are not required. Off-campus, close to 100% of master’s students complete a project other than a thesis.

Placement data provide good indicators of the success of graduate programs. One department that routinely collects such information is the mathematics department, which attempts to track all alumni from its graduate programs. Since the inception of the mathematics Ph.D. program in 2000, there have been 14 degrees awarded; 13 of

49 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), 2003 (available in Resource Room).
50 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/gened/GeneralEducationReport_FINAL.pdf
the graduates are now college or university faculty (11 in the U.S., 2 in Jordan) and 1 works for a consulting firm in Chicago. Of 56 recent graduates of the mathematics MA program, 25 are currently teaching (primarily in community colleges; two are high school teachers), another five have matriculated in graduate programs, 17 have positions in industry and 9 have not been located.

CMU prepares students for independent learning in programs of applied practice

CMU offers a significant number of programs that prepare students for specific practice in a technical field. Many of these programs receive specialized accreditation, and some require that graduates pass certification or licensing exams before beginning independent practice. Students often gain the requisite professional skills through apprenticeships, internships, clinical work, or practical laboratories. CMU also recognizes that the techniques and methods used in these fields will change. In addition to teaching the procedures in use now, these programs have components that provide the theory behind the techniques so that students will be able to adapt to new approaches as practice evolves in the future.

Several diverse examples of where students have practical experiences as part of their academic programs are:

- The College of Business encourages students’ participation in internships and co-op experiences in businesses of all types. Students at the graduate level have opportunities to participate in consulting projects in a formal consulting program within the MBA.

- The College of Health Professions has a number of programs in which internships and supervised practice are a requirement of the program or for eventual licensure. Some students obtain these experiences in clinics run by CMU.

- The College of Education and Human Services has several programs that require or encourage internships or practical work. The largest is student teaching for those studying to be PK-12 educators; to complete the education program, these students must observe, assist, and teach in a variety of school settings, including at least one school that serves students from backgrounds different from that of the prospective teacher. The college's Department of Recreation, Parks and Leisure Services Administration operates an internship program that was heralded for its high quality by that discipline's accrediting body.

- The Master of Science in Administration (MSA) program has a required course for its on-campus students, MSA 681: Practicum. This course was developed when assessments revealed that on-campus students lacked the work experience of their off-campus counterparts.
CMU’s success at preparing students for work in applied fields emerges from students’ performance on certification and licensure examinations after they complete their CMU programs. Examples of programs where students take such exams as part of their program include teacher education, audiology and athletic training/sports medicine. CMU departments regularly receive notice for their students’ outstanding performance on these exams.51

Most of CMU’s graduate students, particularly off-campus, are already working professionals, and have chosen to pursue graduate education because they see the value of such education in their careers, often within the military, government organizations or a K-12 school system. Many of this student group are enrolled in CMU’s largest academic program, the Master of Science in Administration, which is largely offered off-campus. As described above, this program has undergone many changes over the years as it responds the needs of the workforce, and demands of its adult working students.

**CMU prepares its students for a diverse and global environment**

Today’s college graduates increasingly encounter working environments where global awareness and the ability to live and work with people from diverse cultures and backgrounds are essential. Through its degree requirements as well as students’ curricular and co-curricular experiences, CMU seeks to prepare students for success in meeting these demands.

In the 1980s, CMU faculty recognized the importance of including curricular content to promote students’ appreciation of racial diversity and cultural awareness. The Academic Senate added to CMU’s University Program required coursework that emphasizes multicultural and international study. Students are required to take at least one course in each of the following: (a) integrative and interdisciplinary studies, (b) global cultures, and (c) U.S. racism and cultural diversity. Through these courses, CMU strives to help students understand aspects of cultures different from their own, fostering sensitivity to and understanding of cultural, religious, racial and ethnic differences.

As the need for global competence has expanded, CMU has moved to strengthen the preparation of its students in this area, and this is presently CMU’s second institutional priority. Students are encouraged to participate in such activities as study abroad programs and multicultural workshops, although not as many choose to do so as we would like. The opportunities for study abroad have been expanded through the development of some novel programs like student teaching, internships, and service learning opportunities in other countries. There has been some growth in the number of participants in study abroad, and in *CMU 2010* the university commits to further increasing these numbers.
To date, we have not directly measured students’ cultural and global competencies, in part because this is a difficult task. Some evidence that CMU students are being prepared for a global and diverse society comes from CMU faculty. This includes:

- 36% of faculty report having class discussions or writing assignments in their classes that often or very often include the diverse perspectives of race, religion, gender, and political beliefs.
- 32% say that their classes emphasize student’s understanding of people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds.
- 20% say that students often or very often have conversations in their courses with students who are very different from themselves in terms of beliefs, opinions or values.
- 28% see CMU as encouraging contact among students of different economic, social, and racial and ethnic groups.

Even though these areas are not emphasized in certain types of classes or by all faculty, it is obvious that CMU students receive exposure to them. Given that full-time students are taking classes from four or five instructors at the same time, it is likely that they are engaged in diversity-related topics and experiences on a weekly or possibly even daily basis.

CMU students also provide data regarding their preparation for life in a global and diverse society. As shown in Figure 6-13, CMU seniors do not see as much focus on many aspects of cultural awareness and experience as do seniors at other institutions. Part of this may be attributed to the homogeneity of student population that persists at CMU despite efforts to increase the diversity of both the student and faculty/staff populations.

*CMU 2010* lays out strategies for expanding students’ experiences in ways that will further strengthen their diversity and global competencies. One key component is increasing the involvement of faculty, an effort will be led by the Multicultural Education Center. An important role will also be played by President Rao through his continued advocacy for the essential task of enriching the global competencies of CMU students through the curriculum, students’ international experiences, and diversity in the backgrounds of those who study and work at CMU.

---

52 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), 2003 (available in Resource Room).
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Figure 6-13. Seniors’ Experience of Diversity (NSSE 2004)

- Faculty include diverse perspectives in class discussion or assignments
- Institution promotes understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds
- Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity
- Had serious conversations with students who are very different in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values
- Institution encourages contact among students from different economic, social, racial/ethnic backgrounds

EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 4C

Enriching students’ engagement with a global, diverse and technological society is ongoing and the focus of a number of new efforts. Long standing aggressive policies for maintaining the currency of all CMU courses are in place and compliance is being monitored. Within the program review for academic programs, external reviewers are also asked about currency and relevance of the program. Extensive feedback systems are set up within internship programs, student teaching and other instances when CMU students work within organizations external to the university. Certification exams also provide valuable and comparative information regarding the currency and quality of programs. CMU students from various programs also compete and sometimes do very well in national and regional competitions. They also perform or present their work in national and regional venues. Despite all these efforts, it is true more systematic collection of feedback from graduates, employers of graduates, businesses and other employers could help to improve the quality and currency of curricula and programs.

The results of all of these efforts suggest CMU students are being prepared for the challenges they will face, but they also suggest ways students’ preparation can be strengthened. The extent to which such evidence is shared widely and used to promote timely and significant changes when required is uneven across academic units. CMU’s movement toward becoming more data driven in its decision-making will further stimulate individual units’ use of evidence as well.
There is evidence that our graduate programs are meeting important needs, but there remains a need to enhance our understanding of their quality, including a more systematic analysis of theses in programs in which they are required. Tracking of and interaction with graduates have been used by some programs, and it is believed that this type of data collection and analysis could be beneficial to many more programs.

CMU’s effectiveness in improving students’ cultural awareness and understanding of diversity issues lags behind institutional goals that were set several years ago. This continues to be an institutional goal, and the need for success with this goal is certain to be of increasingly greater importance to CMU students’ preparation for life and work in a global, diverse and technological society.

**CORE COMPONENT 4D**

The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

CMU formulates clear statements of the expectation for ethical academic conduct. Furthermore, by placing “integrity” first in its recently adopted vision statement, “CMU will be a nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, research and creative activity, and public service,” CMU enunciates the importance it places on integrity.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

**CMU requires academic integrity of its students**

The Policy on Academic Integrity created by the Academic Senate clearly defines what it means to carry out scholarship and research activities in an ethical manner and what the consequences are for falling short of expectations. The Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Procedures, recently updated by the dean of students and the dean of the College of Graduate Studies, also speaks to academic integrity. Both of these policies are plainly indexed on the graduate bulletin Web page and the dean of students Web page. Students in the Honors program are further bound by the Honors Academic Integrity Policy. Many faculty members incorporate parts of these policies directly into their course syllabi.

Beyond these written policies, every orientation program for new undergraduate and graduate students devotes some time to discussing the expectation of honest and ethical behavior by students in all academic, as well as personal, matters. Graduate students are made aware of these expectations of their academic conduct through discussions with faculty advisors as well as through the *Graduate Handbook*.

---

53 [academicsenate.cmich.edu/NonCad/ACADEMIC_INTEGRITY_POLICY.pdf](http://academicsenate.cmich.edu/NonCad/ACADEMIC_INTEGRITY_POLICY.pdf)

54 [www.cmich.edu/honors/Current Students/academic_integ_policy.htm](http://www.cmich.edu/honors/Current Students/academic_integ_policy.htm)
CMU has policies, procedures, and training related to ethical conduct of scholarly work

Faculty, staff and students are expected to comply with policies that guide and ensure CMU's integrity for scholarly work done within the university or in collaboration with outside entities. The formal guidelines and approval procedures for regulated research as well other research-related policies are listed on the Web site of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. Representative policies in the major areas of importance to the professional and ethical conduct of academic work are listed in Table 6-13.

The policies apply to all who engage in scholarly work, whether or not a project is externally funded. For funded projects, monies are not released until all necessary compliance approvals have been issued. No formal checks are in place to assure compliance for non-funded projects, but instances in which non-compliance has been brought to the institution's attention have been few.

To assist in maintaining professionally responsible actions throughout campus, the university has created an infrastructure that develops, maintains, and periodically updates formal policies and procedures. There are three independent offices involved in this work:

- The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) has responsibility for writing policy and forming and overseeing of the committees which ensure compliance with policies that have binding federal or state guidelines; these are marked with an asterisk in the table.

- CMU’s environmental and safety services department writes policy and oversees matters related to the MIOSHA On-Campus Policy, the Safety Policy and Procedures Manual, and the respiratory protection, bloodborne pathogen control and health hazard communication plans; a single officer deals with the policies and training for the entire campus.

- The CMU safety officer, based in the College of Science and Technology (CST), oversees matters of training, compliance and enforcement related to the safe use, storage, and licensing of chemicals and radioactive materials.

No formal structure links the activities of these three campus offices, and CMU has no compliance officer per se. This leads to a lack of coordination of safety issues. CMU is also vulnerable because some areas of safety are not the responsibility of any one of these three offices. For example, solvents used in the art department would not formally fall under anyone’s supervision, although the safety officer is willing, if asked, to assist parties outside the College of Science and Technology’s to develop protocols. Weaknesses in the current arrangement are important areas for the campus to address in the near future.

Table 6-13. Major Policies Governing Professional and Ethical Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety in the conduct of research</td>
<td>Bloodborne Pathogen Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical Use and Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radiation Use, Licensing and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recombinant DNA Molecules*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazard Communication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIOSHA on Campus Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respiratory Protection Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Policy and Procedures Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of living things used in research</td>
<td>Human Subjects Research (IRB)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research behavior and ethical behavior in the dissemination of results</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Research Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of discoveries, creations, and inventions</td>
<td>Copyright Assistance Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Contract Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drug-free Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORSP Policy Governing Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time &amp; Effort Reporting Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 www.orsp.cmich.edu/Policies.htm
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Specific areas that warrant discussion include the following:

**Use of humans in research.** This area produces the heaviest workload for ORSP. This office manages the work of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), which must review all applications for the use of human subjects as the object of study, and employs a coordinator to oversee the Board. Over the past three years, the committee reviewed between 400 and 500 applications each year, a workload that resulted in some delays long enough to elicit faculty complaint. This, along with the fact that the IRB Committee is dealing with a growing variety of research situations, led the vice provost for research to form an ad hoc committee to look into needed changes in the structure and procedures of the IRB Committee. The recommendations of this group were made in 2004, accepted by the ORSP, and an implementation plan presented to the provost. Some of the recommended have begun to be implemented. One key area that needs to be addressed is the supervising authority. Presently, the supervision of the IRB committee coordinator falls on the associate dean of the graduate school; it would be preferable if CMU had a compliance officer, supervised by ORSP, to handle this. Also, training for IRB committee members meets minimal standards and could be improved; it would be good to have some online training available to those submitting applications for IRB approval.

**Use of animals in research.** The ORSP has its second heaviest workload related to the use of animals in research. The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) oversees this area. Any use of vertebrate animals for research or for teaching must have protocols approved by the IACUC, and facilities used for keeping animals must conform to national standards that include regular inspections. The committee also oversees the work of CMU’s two full-time, certified animal care workers. IACUC reviews about 30 research and teaching protocols each year, a number that has been increasing. The committee guidelines were completely revised in 2004 following advice from an outside consultant, and they are continually being updated. One of the research officers in ORSP tends to the required federal filing duties, a task that more typically would be handled by a compliance officer. Additional training for the members of IACUC would be desirable.

**Use of recombinant DNA in research.** A few CMU researchers are using genetically transformed organisms and/or recombinant DNA in research projects, and some of this work is currently being supported by the National Institutes of Health. Although the investigators have been adhering to the *NIH Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA*, CMU does not have an institutional biosafety committee to oversee the issues involved in this type of research. Recently, ORSP established a committee to create the NIH-required guidelines for the operation of such a committee at CMU. An expert from Michigan State University met with the committee to guide its work, and we hope to establish the Institutional Biosafety Committee by Fall 2005.

**Chemical hygiene plans and radiation safety.** Most work in these areas occurs in the College of Science and Technology, which employs the safety officer. That individual keeps requisite records, provides
training, supervises the Radiation Safety Committee and inspects college facilities for compliance to accepted standards for chemical and radioisotope use. She also provides advice as requested by other departments or faculty outside the College of Science and Technology. She works closely with the individual who manages the Environmental and Safety Services Department on matters of overlapping concern. The coordination between Environmental and Safety Services and the ORSP is minimal.

Ownership of discoveries, creations and inventions. CMU has clear policies on intellectual property rights, including copyrights, trademarks, and patents of our faculty, staff and students, with ORSP responsible for managing the intellectual property assets of CMU. ORSP assists faculty members in filing patents and in searching for commercialization opportunities for patents for which they are authors. In cases of intellectual property that prove to have commercial value, CMU has a relatively generous formula for the sharing of royalties that might derive from those assets. Last year CMU joined three other Michigan universities to create a combined tech transfer office, named U-TEAMED and housed at Michigan Technological University. The state provided $1.26 million for start-up, and patent disclosures from CMU are now being evaluated by U-TEAMED patent officers. This effort will increase the ability of CMU faculty and staff to accelerate economic development in Michigan, while generating financial rewards for themselves and for CMU.

Contracts with outside partners. To avoid misunderstandings and to minimize exposure to individual liability, CMU policy requires clear, written contracts for collaborative projects with both public and private external partners. ORSP is responsible for helping to write and negotiate such external contracts as needed. In the past five years, only a few instances of an external partner defaulting on an agreement with CMU have been recorded in ORSP, suggesting that the protocols being used are working well.

CMU strives to integrate issues of professional and ethical behavior into the curriculum

Since the university is both a creator and user of knowledge and strives to train students in the creation and proper use of new knowledge, CMU takes very seriously its responsibility to maintain ethical standards for the creation of knowledge and for working with students to instill responsible attitudes and behaviors in their handling of knowledge. Much of the training in all areas of ethical behavior in academic work falls to faculty instructors in capstone and designated courses and faculty members who serve as research mentors.

Academic programs commonly include a component on the ethical and responsible use of knowledge. In some cases, there are formal courses, such as the course in business law (BLR 202) for those studying business or the elective courses in ethics offered by the Department of Philosophy and Religion. More often, these expectations are instilled in students.
CMU also has an active Center for Professional and Personal Ethics (CPEE) housed in the Department of Philosophy and Religion. This center supports the study, teaching and practice of ethics through widely attended debates, speakers, films, on-campus courtroom proceedings, and special events. The *Speak Up, Speak Out* ongoing series of debates has vividly highlighted for students the ethical dilemmas that underlie today’s most challenging public policy debates.

**CMU ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly**

The main evidence for compliance with the various policies is the small number of violations. Most instances of academic dishonesty by students are dealt with at the level of the instructor. In more serious cases, allegations are handled by the dean of students. The number of serious violations of the academic integrity policy by students for the past eight years is shown in Table 6-14. The numbers are less than 0.1% of the student body.

During the same period, the College of Graduate Studies had no formal “proceedings,” but was approached six times over allegations or requests for advice on matters of academic integrity. Assuming that faculty members are rigorous in their enforcement of our policies, these relatively small numbers suggest that students generally understand and abide by the policies. Vigilance on the part of faculty is the key to right practices in this regard.

Faculty themselves exhibit sound ethical behavior as demonstrated by the fact that, since 1996, only two investigations were made of alleged violations of the Policy on Research Integrity by faculty with just one case resulting in a finding of research misconduct.

Evidence that suggests that faculty are in general aware of their responsibility for ethical work in research is that many faculty incorporate elements dealing with ethical academic behavior into their courses and the large numbers of IRB and IACUC permission requests are submitted. Also, regular training of IRB Committee members is required, as is training in the safe use of chemicals for those who use them and CMU carries out this training on a regular basis. A faculty handbook containing all key policies, procedures, and resources for faculty would facilitate compliance with university expectations.

---

57 A survey for such courses revealed FIN 332 (serving 900 students/year), twelve courses in psychology, two courses in gerontology, ten courses in human and environmental studies, four courses in history, seven courses in sociology, and multiple courses in counseling and special education or as a component of student research projects (e.g., senior thesis projects, graduate theses).
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EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 4D

CMU has several institutional strengths with respect to ensuring the proper acquisition and use of knowledge. The university has very clearly written documents detailing policies and procedures and expectations for behavior that cover nearly all aspects of academic work. There is an understanding of who is responsible for each of the various areas. Compliance with written policies on the part of faculty, staff and students generally appears to be good; most policies are recognized as reasonable and are followed.

Several inadequacies exist in our current infrastructure and most of these are being addressed. No institutional biosafety committee with related policies is in place, although research covered subject to this NIH requirement is in progress on campus and NIH grants have been awarded to several faculty members. Work has begun to establish the needed committee and policies. CMU has neither a central office nor a compliance officer for ensuring compliance on all research work nor is there a formal committee to connect activities across campus. The majority of the compliance work has fallen to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, the staff of which already have full workloads in handling grants and contracts. The numbers of applications for IRB approval have swamped the system at times, making it difficult for the committee to provide timely responses. Some changes are being initiated to address these deficiencies; these include adopting new online application procedures, expanding committee structures, and improving the training of committee members.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

STRENGTHS

1. Co-Curricular Activities: CMU students in general are actively engaged in a wide variety of co-curricular activities and view CMU as supportive of these experiences.

2. Professional Development: CMU has developed appropriate and effective on-campus professional development opportunities for faculty through FaCIT and for staff and administrators through the Supervision Excellence series sponsored by Human Resources.

3. Research and Creative Activity: Many CMU faculty actively contribute to scholarship in their disciplines through publication, performance, and presentation. Graduate and undergraduate students contribute to these efforts in a number of ways.

4. Research and Creative Activity Support: CMU provides strong support for students and faculty to engage in research and creative activities, and recognizes their scholarly achievements.

5. Grant Writing: There have been significant increases in grant proposal submissions and in grants awarded in the past five years.
6. **Faculty Information**: 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.

7. **General Education**: The general education program is being reviewed holistically for the first time in many years. Higher expectations for students’ competency in mathematics and writing are being implemented.

8. **International Education**: Emphasis has been placed on international education. The number of CMU students studying abroad is increasing although still low relative to our total enrollments.

9. **Academic Program Review**: CMU’s restructured program review process focuses on student learning outcomes and continuous improvement and makes use of external peer review.

10. **Policies and Procedures**: Appropriate policies and procedures governing research are in place to protect individual and institutional rights and ensure regulatory compliance. Instances of non-compliance are rare.

**CONCERNS**

1. **Co-Curricular Activities**: 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.

2. **Professional Development**: Budget cuts have weakened CMU’s on-campus professional development opportunities for its staff and faculty.

3. **Research and Creative Activity Support**: External funding received and the proportion of expenditures dedicated to research fall below those of our benchmark institutions. There is a need for ongoing monitoring of graduate assistantships funding relative to benchmark institutions. The infrastructure to support grant and contract activity is inadequate to address current and expected increases in activity.

4. **Equipment**: CMU does not have an institutional plan or budget to support equipment replacement, which threatens the long-term viability of equipment-intensive teaching and research efforts.

5. **General Education**: The amount and quality of evidence regarding student learning within general education is inadequate and what evidence exists suggests students are not achieving satisfactory outcomes in a number of areas. Review of the general education program is progressing slowly, with initial conclusions being that the program lacks cohesiveness and its governance and management need revision and increased faculty leadership.
6. **International Education**: There is a need for improved integration of international experiences into academic programs to enhance students’ understanding of global perspectives. The number of international students coming into the university is decreasing.

7. **Program Assessment**: 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.

8. **Research Infrastructure**: The campus needs policies and a committee for biosafety and additional staff for assuring compliance in all research work. Participation in the faculty information database is uneven. The services that support grant and contract activity are inadequate to address current and expected increases in activity.

9. **Faculty Handbook**: A compendium of key policies, procedures, and resources for faculty is needed to facilitate compliance with university expectations.

10. **Budget Reductions**: CMU’s budget has undergone significant cuts and any additional reductions in the future can be expected to negatively impact attempt to address these weaknesses.
CHAPTER 7
CRITERION 5

As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value
CRITERION FIVE

As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

Central Michigan University has a strong record of service, an outgrowth of the fundamental mission of the institution to “serve Michigan and the larger community.” This commitment has evolved to cover a large range of services.

First and foremost, both internal and external constituencies are served through CMU’s basic mission to provide quality educational programs and to generate and disseminate new knowledge through research and creative activities. Not only do students directly benefit from the preparation they receive; the public benefits from the learning achieved, from the knowledge created, and from the values of social responsibility acquired by these students as they transition into the workplace.

A second, wide-ranging category of service involves the outreach programs/activities/services, cultural and recreational provisions, and community/regional collaborations that develop as natural extensions of the higher learning processes going on within the university. Service learning is a good example of the university broadening its educational impact by engaging and serving external constituencies. Most units within the university contribute their expertise in ways that provide services to those who need and value them. This chapter will focus on these areas of service and engagement that connect the university with its many external constituencies. Although we could not list all of the engagement and service that occurs at CMU, this chapter focuses on the various types and attempts to provide examples of each.

MISSION ELEMENTS

CMU’s mission statement begins by stating its intentions to serve:

“Central Michigan University serves Michigan and the larger community as a doctoral/research-intensive public university . . .”

This makes clear that the university serves a wider audience than the students enrolled in its programs. This is further clarified by a number of statements in the mission documents that address specific aspects of this public service. For example, the last two paragraphs of the mission statement contain these commitments:

“Through its support of research, the university enhances learning opportunities of both its undergraduate and graduate students and promotes economic, cultural, and social development.”

“Through its partnerships and outreach efforts, the university promotes learning outside the traditional classroom and enhances the general welfare of society.”

Goals through which CMU intends to accomplish its mission speak to serving both our internal constituencies,
DEFINING CMU’S CONSTITUENCIES

In its mission statement, CMU defines its primary constituents as “Michigan and the larger community.” For the purposes of this self-study it was found useful to refine this broad definition to more specific groups.

The primary internal constituencies have been chosen to be CMU’s students, faculty, and staff.

The external constituencies vary by operational unit. They include alumni; communities (general public, parents, taxpayers, retirees); employers (those interviewing and hiring our graduates, employing our interns); donors; governmental bodies (local, state and federal, accrediting agencies); service recipients (athletic event attendees, public broadcasting viewers, patients in our various clinics); and vendors/contractors/partners (e.g., Central Michigan University Research Corporation, school districts, other institutions of higher education).

Goal 8: Provide an environment that allows for broad-based community involvement and participation in democratic civic life.

Goal 10: Offer co-curricular activities, including Division IA athletics, which enhance intellectual, cultural, social, ethical, physical and emotional development.

and to serving our external ones:

Goal 4: Encourage the practice of values pertaining to professionalism, character and citizenship, including concern for the welfare of humanity, dedication to public service and awareness of social issues confronting a diverse global society.

Goal 13: Provide service for the public good.

CMU’s core values include two targeted at public service beyond the campus:

Core Value: Serving the larger community, recognizing an obligation to serve the public interest and to merge theory and practice;

Core Value: Professional responsibility, taking seriously the impact of performance on each other, on the learning community, and upon society.

Finally, one of our institutional priorities is:

Institutional Priority IV: Provide service for the public good.

It is abundantly clear that service beyond the campus is an important part of the Central Michigan University ethos.

CORE COMPONENT 5A

The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.

CMU’s broad service commitment has led to a large and diverse array of initiatives. Because CMU offers so many services to both internal and external constituencies, and each one of these services uses one or more methods for soliciting feedback, this section must confine its discussion to a few representative service units. To discuss all that CMU does in this area would exceed the limits of this report.

Many examples of internal services have been discussed in the previous chapters, such as student support services and offices to support faculty teaching and scholarship. In this section we focus on four institutional units that are primarily service-oriented and have particularly broad impacts on the communities they serve. These are:

- **ProfEd**: Created in the early 1970s, this unit has served off-campus student populations with limited access to traditional
classes offered through colleges and universities. Starting with courses geared toward military personnel, and moving into courses designed for working adults in urban settings, our off-campus programs have evolved as the needs of its students have evolved. Today, ProfEd offers programs at more than 60 off-campus sites and through distance learning options. About 8,000 students were enrolled in Fall 2004 term classes.

- **Charter Schools**: CMU is the nation’s leading university authorizer of charter schools. As of the 2004-05 school year, CMU has issued charter contracts to 57 charter schools. Those schools are located throughout Michigan and serve nearly 27,000 of the state’s 2 million school children. This office also works to provide policy direction, advocacy and high-level support to the charter school movement as a whole. The team has developed a nationally renowned charter schools’ oversight model.

- **Public Broadcasting**: Established in 1967, this unit provides television and radio programming to two million residents of 52 counties in central and northern Michigan and portions of Ontario. With six television and seven radio stations, CMU Public Broadcasting is the largest university-owned public broadcasting network in the nation.

- **Athletics**: Competing in NCAA Division I since 1974, this unit sponsors seven sports for men and nine for women that involve over 400 student athletes and attracts about 140,000 spectators per year.

These areas were chosen because they are relatively large units and impact numerous constituents, both internal and external. They represent service units that have evolved out of the needs of the community and of the university, and also illustrate how CMU has been able to grow units that have strong service records that satisfy or exceed the needs of those being served. In this way, CMU has been very proactive in its relations with its constituencies; it has been typically very effective in analyzing what it can realistically accomplish with the resources it has available.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

*CMU conducts periodic environmental scanning to understand the changing needs of its constituencies*

Units are expected to assess how well they serve constituent needs. Different units approach this in different ways. In analyzing where, how and who to serve, some make very specifically targeted inquiries, while others solicit more broad-based feedback. The information gathered is
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2 www.cmucso.org/
3 www.wcmu.org/insidewcmu/aboutus.htm
4 cmuchippewas.collegesports.com/
used to evaluate the quality of ongoing services and the capacity of units to meet requests for additional service.

A convenient way a number of groups gather data from their constituents is through CMU’s in-house data collection organization, the Center for Applied Research and Rural Studies (CARRS). CARRS operates a state-of-the-art computer-aided telephone interview (CATI) laboratory for survey data collection and has a pool of trained and educated interviewers drawn from the CMU student population. CARRS can assist groups with survey design and data analysis, making use of the specialized expertise in the CMU community (such as faculty in areas of statistics, business, and social sciences) and its access to numerous informational databases and centers. CARRS has conducted surveys for units such as the Department of Athletics, the Academic Senate, the offices of the president and provost, and the CMU library.

Our four representative units illustrate the various ways by which information is gathered and analyzed and services evaluated.

**ProfEd**

Formerly known as the College of Extended Learning (CEL), ProfEd is the reorganized unit that manages off-campus programs. The new name, ProfEd, is a shortened version of “Professional Education Services.” Its revised mission statement reads:

_The mission of ProfEd is to deliver high quality, fiscally sound, responsive-to-market programs to adult learners._

ProfEd regularly conducts systematic research on adult learning and has dedicated resources for market analyses in order to set program design, direction and delivery. Data on enrollment trends; student grades, retention, and graduation rates; student opinions; budget factors; and competitor programs are routinely monitored. This unit also regularly works with corporations to determine relevant graduate programs to deliver to employees. This feedback began to reveal that the needs of both internal and external constituencies were changing and that CMU needed to become a more competitive and therefore more effective organization.

A comprehensive study was carried out concerning the changing landscape of off-campus higher education and where CMU fits into that landscape. Using the wealth of data that ProfEd has available, a series of summary technical reports were created. A broad survey of students, faculty and staff yielded feedback on their perceptions of the unit’s
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5 www.chsbs.cmich.edu/CARRS/
6 CARRS services are also available to local social, economic, and governmental agencies. Various clients have included: the Midland Visiting Nurse Association, Bresnan Communications, Chippewa River District Library, Isabella County Commission, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, and the cities of Midland, Mt. Pleasant, and Bay City.
7 www.cel.cmich.edu/faculty/docs/reports-completed.pdf
8 www.cel.cmich.edu/faculty/docs/cral-org-analysis.pdf
strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. All of this information helped to direct an informed reorganization process.

A major finding was the decline in student course enrollment in the past few years (see Figure 7-1). This is attributed to increased competition, and also to deployments of students in the armed forces. These enrollment declines negatively impact the variety of courses and programs that can be offered in certain locations, which may lead to further enrollment concerns.

ProfEd has been aggressively trying to address declining enrollments by identifying new markets and niches, and changing the way it does business. In a recent report, it was stated, “our mandate [is] to shift from a reactive, processes-oriented organization to a proactive, customer-oriented, student services business.” The provost has formalized two new arrangements between ProfEd and on-campus college deans and faculty to encourage the development and smooth running of new programs and the development of on-line courses. These relationships with campus units are critical to ProfEd since all credit-bearing off-campus programs and courses have an on-campus academic home and are subject to the same curricular processes as those offered on campus.

Despite these changes underway, ProfEd’s relationship to the campus continues to be a challenge, as it is at many traditional institutions with extensive extended degree program offerings. It seems that at any time, there are one or two committees studying how to strategically position ProfEd or how to facilitate the relationship between on-campus units and ProfEd. For instance, the chief concern of a recent Academic Senate Board of Visitors report was inconsistencies in grades assigned in on- and off-campus offerings of the same course. The chief concern of another committee, working simultaneously and within ProfEd, was the need to be more flexible, timely and responsive to market needs for programs, calling for a shift in the paradigm under which CMU develops programs (Six Month Review; Off-campus Programs9). Often there is little overlap in the focus and conclusions of different study groups.

CMU is trying to address the challenges of sustaining a viable and healthy off-campus operation. As noted in a recent review prepared by ProfEd, there are “levels of support from the Board of Trustees, the president, the provost, the deans, and permeating deeply into the faculty that we have not seen before in our recent history.”10 Whether this support will result in a more effective organization that is better suited to the present competitive environment as well as better tie the off-campus programs to the main campus remains to be seen.

**Charter schools**

As outlined in its 2004 *Annual Report*,11 the CMU Charter Schools Office conducts regular evaluations of the schools it authorizes. It is notable that in 2002, CMU was proclaimed by the Michigan Department
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9 Six Month Review; Off-campus Programs (available in Resource Room).
10 Six Month Review; Off-campus Programs (available in Resource Room).
of Education as the “gold standard” for appropriate charter school oversight.\textsuperscript{12}

Evaluative data are collected in six core competencies: federal accountability, state accountability, value-added analysis, financial viability, board operations, and site and facilities review. The comprehensive nature of the data collected enables this unit to monitor schools, determine strengths and weaknesses, provide assistance in cases that call for it, or close schools that do not meet the accountability standards established by the Charter Schools Office. As a result of charter school evaluations, 82 charter contracts have been reauthorized and seven charter contracts have been denied reauthorization.

**Public Broadcasting**

Public Broadcasting’s listening area contains over 2.5 million residents in central and northern Michigan and portions of Ontario, Canada. When the federally-mandated conversion to digital television is completed in 2006, the six-station television network will provide numerous opportunities to broadcast multiple programs simultaneously. In addition to its regular programming, the enhanced digital spectrum will allow new, needed services to be provided to such groups as teachers, state employees, and emergency management personnel.

Public Broadcasting seeks input from its constituencies in several ways. First, the normal fundraising process actively encourages donors to also comment on programming and outreach services. This may come in the form of listener/viewer comments during on-air pledging, donor comments in response to a direct mail solicitation, or comments associated with telemarketing efforts to lapsed donors. Public Broadcasting donors total approximately 14,000 annually, providing roughly $2 million in private support for television and radio. This total has risen modestly over the last few years, following nationwide trends.

Second, Public Broadcasting frequently surveys both listeners and viewers about their attitudes regarding programming and outreach. They also survey other groups, such as CMU faculty, who received a questionnaire during the 2004-05 year regarding use of public broadcasting services in courses. That Public Broadcasting is responsive to this feedback was demonstrated in their quick response to listener complaints after a scheduling change was made for broadcasting the BBC News.

**Athletics**

CMU’s intercollegiate athletics program serves two primary constituencies: the student-athletes and sports fans. Athletics conducts student-athlete surveys to assess their experiences and satisfaction levels with the coaching and other services. Findings are used to identify trends and define goals for the department. Athletics also solicits reports from instructors to monitor athletes’ academic performance. The regular
recognition of CMU athletes with academic achievement awards attests to the effectiveness of this process.

Fans provide feedback to Athletics directly through comments and, indirectly, through the attendance numbers for the various athletic events. The total number of spectators attending athletic events in 2004-05 was about 140,000; over half of this (75,000) was for football.

**EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 5A**

CMU offers a multitude of services to meet the needs of many constituencies. In determining how it can best meet these needs, the service units do their own assessments and adjust their outreach in ways that best use the resources available to them. Specific examples that included ProfEd, Charter Schools, Public Broadcasting, and Athletics illustrate the various ways in which individual units seek feedback and then make adjustments to accommodate needs. These examples demonstrate that assessment is decentralized and that this facilitates effective change within these units.

**CORE COMPONENT 5B**

The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.

CMU serves a broad constituency base. The needs of these constituencies are great and the university makes extensive efforts to address them. The fact that CMU builds and sustains programs over long periods of time demonstrates the university’s commitment to providing those services. CMU defines civic engagement as an active partnership — either formal or informal — between an external community and CMU faculty, staff, or students for the purpose of enriching life.

Several aspects of CMU’s operations contribute to civic engagement. First, CMU has a strong service orientation, a characteristic noted within its mission statements. Second, CMU does an excellent job of using its resources in ways that create positive impact in multiple areas: combining community needs with student coursework benefits multiple parties; using faculty and staff expertise for service needs makes the best use of resources. Third, the members of the CMU community itself are characteristically strong and active volunteers themselves. Finally, the financial and physical resources at CMU are made available when possible. Overall, CMU rightfully takes pride in the long-term commitments it has made to continually strengthen and improve its service provisions and its engagement with constituencies.
EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT

CMU has made an institutional commitment to service

CMU has long been recognized as an institution with a strong emphasis on providing service. This commitment to service is made clear by its mission statements. As noted at the start of this chapter, both CMU’s list of core values and the current institutional priorities specifically address service to the public.

CMU also demonstrates its commitment to service through its actions. Two of the many examples of institutional support for service are the Service Excellence Initiative and the university’s involvement in the local United Way. The Service Excellence Initiative, started in Fall 2001, is an institutional service training and recognition program based on four principles: care, knowledge, availability and follow-through. More than 70 workshops (roughly 20 per year) focusing on providing excellent service have trained more than 2,000 staff, faculty and student workers; over 100 people have been recognized for providing outstanding service.

CMU is one of the major partners in the annual United Way of Isabella County campaign, and members of the CMU community regularly serve on the United Way Board. When employee campaign contributions began to decline, CMU established a committee to address the issue. The strategies developed led to contributions in 2004 of $76,068, far surpassing the goal of $60,000 and achieving one of the highest amounts ever raised on campus.

CMU has the capacity to engage the external constituents it has committed to serve

CMU’s physical facilities, financial resources and human resources are adequate to offer the many services it provides.

Physical facilities

Many campus facilities are regularly utilized by those outside the CMU community. Those visited most often by the general public are Park Library, Student Activity Center (SAC), Bush Theatre, performance halls in the Music Building, Bovee University Center, Plachta Auditorium, Finch Fieldhouse and facilities for athletic events. Those used mainly by specialized groups include the intramural fields, the professional clinics in the Health Professions Building, the Multicultural Center, the Learning Resource Center, and the residence halls. The following examples illustrate how facilities are used by non-CMU groups.

- The Indoor Athletics Complex and Rose Arena provide exceptional facilities where the campus and community can enjoy athletic events involving university and club sport teams. K-12 students from around the state use these facilities when they participate in the summer sports camps. They are also used for non-athletic
activities such as exhibitions, charity and fundraising events (e.g., CMU and local high school commencement ceremonies, Home Builders Show, Relay for Life, Jock Rock, Destination/Imagination).

- Residence halls are used throughout the year, and particularly in the summer, to house conference participants. During 2003-2004, 92 different conferences involved 16,194 guests staying a total of 77,793 nights. Examples of events include Special Olympics Michigan summer games, youth sports camps, music and cheer camps, and academic conferences.

- CMU owns three off-campus natural areas that are frequented by external groups. Neithercut Woodland, near Farwell, is used by both campus and external organizations for educational and recreational activities. CMU’s Biological Station, located on Beaver Island, offers a diversity of courses and programs during the spring and summer months. Veit’s-Dow Woodland, an undeveloped area on the west side of Mt. Pleasant, is used extensively by the public for recreation.

Financial resources

The majority of the university’s resources are obviously budgeted in support of its academic mission. In many cases, however, funds for academic needs also support the university’s service activities. For example, investments in residence halls benefit students living there during the academic year; these facilities also benefit external constituencies who come to campus during the summer months. Expenditures made in support of music and theater performances benefit students majoring in related academic areas and also benefit the public.

Aside from providing this indirect support, CMU budgets some financial resources to support activities that are specifically service-oriented, such as the Volunteer Center, the Leadership Institute, and the Charter Schools Office. In other cases, funds are raised through the development arm of the university to support activities that benefit the general public. A recent and exciting example of this is the Michigan Story Festival, an annual event since 2003 that attracts people from all over the Great Lakes region.

Human resources

The majority of faculty, staff and students at CMU are actively engaged in service. For some employees this is part of their regular assignment; for most, it is something they do above and beyond their regular work for CMU. Students in student organizations and residence halls actively participate in community service projects in addition to the service learning they do as part of their coursework. Many faculty and staff
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not only actively participate in their professional organizations, they often serve as leaders hosting state, regional and national meetings on campus. Many volunteer in the community and serve on non-profit boards as noted earlier in this Core Component 5B section.

As shown in Chapter 4, *Preparing for the Future*, CMU’s student-to-staff ratio and student-to-faculty ratio are both larger than most organizations of its type. Although CMU has been able to offer high quality service, there are concerns whether we can continue to do so as decreasing financial resources necessitate more and more position eliminations. As support positions have been cut, the university has been innovative in trying to maintain the levels of service; for example, senior citizens who wish to make use of the Student Activity Center can do so free of charge by volunteering their time to help operate the facility.

**Faculty and staff expertise creates valuable opportunities for service**

The university represents a valuable resource in terms of the collective expertise that resides within its faculty and staff. Many members of the CMU community serve as consultants and advisers, often without compensation, in their areas of expertise. CMU also has developed a number of programs to provide service to area residents. A few examples include:

*The LaBelle Entrepreneurial Center* (LEC) within the College of Business Administration is a focal point for new business development and educational activities related to entrepreneurship and small business management. This center combines area economic needs with student needs to gain experience in developing new business ventures. Students in the entrepreneurship major work with companies to solve business problems. Created in 1998, this center accommodated approximately 300 signed majors in 2004. Nearly 75 consulting opportunities with existing businesses were created to meet the needs of these students.

*The Center for Applied Research and Technology* (CART) is a 350-acre site designated by the Michigan Economic Development Corporation as one of eleven Michigan SmartZones. The Mt. Pleasant SmartZone has been designed to attract and stimulate high-tech businesses that require a synergistic relationship with a research-intensive university. CART represents a joint venture between CMU, Middle Michigan Development Corporation, and the City of Mt. Pleasant. Businesses who choose to partner with CMU gain access to a range of resources such as faculty and student researchers, advanced research labs, high-speed Internet connectivity, sophisticated software applications, and super-computing capacity.

*Geographic Information Systems Center* (GISC) was established in 1994 to facilitate and handle the rapidly increasing amounts of spatially referenced data for central and northern Michigan. These data are
being used for application projects, research, and teaching. Services are provided to cities, townships, and counties in developing and managing their mapping and geographic information systems needs.

*The Carls Center for Clinical Care and Education* brings together, in one multidisciplinary clinic, a number of client-related health services. The Carls Center provides comprehensive diagnostic and rehabilitation services including hearing evaluations, hearing aid fittings, speech and language evaluations, balance evaluations, and counseling/psychological services. A number of services not readily available in the central Michigan area are offered, such as cochlear implant fitting, vestibular therapy and augmentative/alternative communication. Patients come from over twenty Michigan counties. CMU students provide services under the supervision of certified and licensed practitioners as part of their academic programs in audiology, speech pathology, psychology, physical therapy, and the physician assistant program.

**Combining service with curriculum allows CMU to meet multiple needs**

Our student outreach programs conform to the CMU mission statement by providing a quality, broad undergraduate education that prepares students for a thoughtful life of service to the community. Their education also serves as a base for future academic and professional work and ensures CMU students will be knowledgeable and skilled, liberally educated persons. We encourage the practice of values pertaining to professionalism, character and citizenship, including concern for the welfare of humanity, dedication to public service and awareness of the social issues confronting a diverse global society.

CMU provides an environment that allows for broad-based community involvement and participation in democratic civic life; provides educational experiences and programs to enhance mutual trust, respect, understanding and sense of community with people from all backgrounds and cultures and to ensure an international and global perspective; and provides service for the public good. Common service avenues are through internships, volunteer activities, and service learning. Specialized service opportunities exist in some areas; examples are the science activities conducted for local schools by chemistry and physics students, and the program that encourages international students to share their cultures.⁵

**Internships**

Internships provide valuable hands-on learning experiences for students as well as providing valuable services to business, health, social, and other organizations. Significant numbers of CMU students take advantage of internship opportunities. For example, from a survey of 2,732 graduates in 2001-02, 62% of business majors and 50% of liberal arts majors indicated that they had completed an internship. These large percentages are confirmed by NSSE data that show that more than 75%

⁵ [www.oie.cmich.edu/curstudents/int_resource_prog.asp](http://www.oie.cmich.edu/curstudents/int_resource_prog.asp)
of CMU seniors report having participated or planned to participate in internships (see Figure 7-2). These data were more fully discussed in Chapter 5, *Student Learning and Effective Teaching*.

**Figure 7-2. Experiential Learning Trends at CMU as Reported by Senior Undergraduate Students (NSSE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Internship</th>
<th>Volunteer Work</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
<th>Capstone Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Volunteer Center**

The Volunteer Center’s mission is “to provide students the opportunity to serve their community, enhance their educational experience and develop into caring citizens.” This center partners with several hundred non-profit agencies through our seven regional partnerships in mid-Michigan, and with the George Romney Volunteer Center in Detroit, to develop quality volunteer opportunities for CMU students. In addition, the center places student reading tutors in 11 rural public school districts as part of the America Reads literacy program. Through the Alternative Break Program, CMU students work on social justice issues at over 24 non-profit sites around world. In 2004-05, the volunteer center coordinated 784 local events that involved over 1,000 students. Figure 7-2 shows that over 70% of CMU seniors participated in volunteer activities.

**Service learning**

Service learning is a pedagogical model that integrates academic learning and community service. Students learn and develop through participation in service experiences with an organization meeting community needs. These experiences are integrated into the student's academic curriculum, allowing students to apply what they learn in the classroom to real-world situations. Students also gain an appreciation for the importance of community service. Approximately 60 faculty members regularly use service learning in their courses. Teacher Education and Professional Development, Human Environmental Studies, Recreation, Parks & Leisure Services and Interpersonal and Public Communication are departments that use service-learning most regularly.
CMU provides cultural and educational opportunities for the citizens of northern and central Michigan

Campus and local events
CMU presents numerous events that are open to the public, often free of charge. These include university theater productions, musical performances, and athletic events, as well as speakers, forums, films, and other events that are offered on campus. CMU also co-sponsors with local groups such events as the Michigan Story Festival, the Central Michigan International Film Festival and the Mt. Pleasant Summer Festival. In 2003-04, more than 450,000 persons visited campus to participate in one or more events.

Park Library
CMU’s library is a resource that serves external audiences as well as the campus. Available resources include specialized collections (U.S. government depository, Clarke Historical Library) as well as print and electronic resources. Library services include reference assistance in person, by phone and by email to help all users answer questions. There are over 300 public access computers connected to the Internet, and group meeting spaces. A number of events draw community members to the auditorium located on the library ground floor. Data on the numbers of people making use of these services is difficult to obtain. Some indication of outside patronage is provided by the following: 1) Clarke Historical Collection records show that approximately one-third of the 2,000 users in 2004 were from off campus, and 2) library card records indicate that 3,000 external patrons made use of their borrowing privileges over the past two years.

Public Broadcasting
As discussed earlier in this chapter, Public Broadcasting provides regular cultural and educational programming through television and radio to residents of central and northern Michigan and parts of Canada. CMU Public Broadcasting also produces a number of special, more locally-focused programs on politics, health, music and other topics. The potential audience base is over two million.

Services for specific groups
Besides the general public, CMU provides educational opportunities and health-related services for specific groups. Three examples are:

- CMU offers music lessons all year and summer camps in sports, music, cheerleading and other areas for youth;
- The senior citizen tuition waiver program permits seniors to audit classes free of charge; every semester 15-25 people take advantage of this opportunity;
- The Carls Center for Clinical Care and Education provides clinical services for patients with hearing, speech or psychological needs.
There is a commitment to service by the CMU community itself

CMU encourages its faculty, staff, and students to initiate and participate in activities and opportunities that in some way benefit others. The provost and the vice president for finance and administrative services collected information on community service and civic engagement in 2004. A survey revealed that:

- Campus members participate in a large number and wide variety of volunteer activities;
- Most of the volunteer activities are associated with education, campus, and religious organizations or “interest specific” groups like the Midland Symphony Orchestra;
- Most people participate in short-term activities rather than ongoing commitments;
- Most are motivated by personal interest/satisfaction;
- Most said they did not want CMU to sponsor volunteer activities;
- Many said they would be interested in information on available opportunities, which might involve expanding Volunteer Center services to faculty and staff.

Every college and most other units within the university have outreach programs that respond to identified community needs. Registered student organizations, especially fraternities and sororities, conduct service projects. A list of sample programs can be found in Appendix 7-1. Two examples, one of student involvement and one of faculty/staff involvement, are:

- In the Department of Athletics, the Life Skills program engages student-athletes, coaches and staff in community service projects and fundraisers throughout the academic year. The department also supports Saginaw Chippewa Indian tribal youth sport programs through the tribe’s Anishinaabe Athletics Youth Association (AAYA). Students participate in camps/clinics, banquets, meetings, and other AAYA programs.
- Many faculty and staff serve in leadership roles in the local community. At the present time, there are members of the CMU community serving on the Isabella County Commission, the Mt. Pleasant School Board, and the boards of Central Michigan Community Hospital and United Way, as well as many others.

EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 5B

CMU has made an institutional commitment to providing service for the public good, and it utilizes its resources quite well in providing a wide range of valued services and cultural opportunities to the regional community and to citizens of Michigan. Physical facilities and financial...
resources are often used in ways that advance both CMU’s educational mission and its service mission. Through internships, service learning, and volunteer activities, students serve the community while enriching their education. Through service that makes use of their expertise, faculty and staff contribute valuable skills and knowledge to many activities, ranging from service to their professions to serving on local boards.

Budget challenges are affecting our ability to maintain and improve current service levels. Sufficient resources, both financial and human, to do the job well must be available. If funding remains limited, CMU will need to focus on the areas of greatest priority and eliminate others. Service is another area that would benefit from better planning. A lack of comprehensive planning and centralized coordination creates the potential for duplicating services or offering competing programs. It has also limited systematic development of programs to meet current and future demands, resulting instead in a short-term perspective in which immediate problems become the primary focus.

**CORE COMPONENT 5C**

The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.

There are a number of external constituencies with which CMU has naturally developed collaborative relationships. In many cases, the relationship is one of interdependence. The most important external constituencies which we have such relationships are: other institutions of higher education, the K-12 school systems in CMU’s service area, and the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe.

CMU demonstrates its responsiveness to constituent needs in the many collaborative ventures that it undertakes with a wide variety of partners. These partnerships provide for efficient and effective communication between CMU and its partners to create working arrangements that meet the needs of all concerned.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS COMPONENT**

**CMU has collaborative arrangements with other institutions of higher learning**

The university has a significant number (48) and variety of articulation agreements with Michigan community colleges. Each of these agreements is a result of long-term cooperative planning between academic leaders from CMU and the community colleges. Every effort is made to provide a seamless transfer of undergraduates from the community college to the university. Transfer equivalencies between
community college and CMU courses are listed on CMU’s Web site. CMU participates in the Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (MACRAO) agreement which allows students to satisfy the University Program portion of the General Education Requirements with their community college coursework. In programs like education and business where there are upper division admissions standards and policies, the community college students are provided with information and complete access consistent with that of students who began their programs as freshmen at CMU.

Students are assisted in transferring to CMU or from CMU. For incoming students, the university provides a transfer credit evaluation during their academic orientation program in advance of registering for their first session at CMU. CMU extends the spirit of the MACRAO Agreement through its “transfer block” option for students transferring from other four-year colleges and universities.

A number of students leave CMU to complete professional programs at other institutions (e.g. optometry, pharmacy, nursing, architecture). CMU has faculty pre-professional advisors that work with these students to ensure that they meet the entrance requirements for their prospective programs. These advisors also monitor our pre-professional programs to assure that they continue to meet the expectations of the professional schools.

ProfEd has developed partnerships with many other institutions of higher education like Northwestern Michigan College, Kingston College, Humber College, and the Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara to deliver educational programs that are designed to meet the unique needs of the learners at those specific locations. In addition, similar partnerships are developed by ProfEd to adapt existing CMU programs to the needs of local learners in government and industry locations, including Chrysler Financial in Detroit, Michigan; the Defense Contracting Audit Agency in Memphis, Tennessee; the Command and General Staff College in Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas; and the Joint Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Virginia. In all instances, the student outcomes remain essentially the same as the campus programs, but the context of the coursework is clearly focused on the needs of the learners at that location.

**CMU has established collaborations involving K-12 school systems**

Given CMU’s long tradition as a teacher training institution, an important external constituency encompasses those involved in K-12 education. The College of Education and Human Services conducts annual surveys and obtains feedback from student teachers, graduates and employers, and responds to needs by providing a number of innovative programs. Some of the programs that have been developed as a result of feedback include:

---

24 [webs.cmich.edu/aga/](http://webs.cmich.edu/aga/)

25 [www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/AA-CEL and MOUs update.pdf](http://www.cmich.edu/hlc-accreditation/downloads/AA-CEL and MOUs update.pdf)
• The alternate route to teacher certification (ARC) program provides professionals in other fields to pursue a career change to teaching. The compressed format is available online and on-campus to support the needs of the working, nontraditional student.

• The Department of Educational Administration and Community Leadership (EACL) offers graduate programs targeted at educators who want advanced degrees qualifying them for school leadership positions. These presently include the doctoral program in educational leadership and cohort programs in Master of Arts—School Principalship. The latter meets constituent needs by bringing an entire program to a selected site off-campus. Student feedback indicates that access to these programs is appreciated.

CMU continues to partner with area high schools to concurrently enroll high achieving juniors and seniors who wish to supplement their high school experience with advanced courses not available in their schools. Approximately 110 students participate each year from six different high schools.

Central Michigan University was the first state university in Michigan to authorize a charter public school, which it authorized in 1994, and has continued to be a leader in charter school development. CMU is the largest university authorizer of charter schools in the nation, having chartered 57 of the 216 operating in Michigan.

The CMU Board of Trustees committed itself to chartering schools in the belief that this would serve as a catalyst for improving education. The Charter Schools Office seeks to help advance this vision by developing links and strategic partnerships between CMU and charter school students, families, administrators and board. In this effort, the Charter Schools Office hosts group visits to CMU, encourages CMU’s College of Education and Human Services (EHS) to place student teachers in charter schools, and has helped to develop an alternative route to elementary certification designed to meet the specific needs of charter school educators. Currently, the Charter Schools Office is helping launch an online master’s program in a collaborative effort with EHS, ProfEd, and the National Charter Schools Institute.

Other examples of CMU collaborations with constituencies in the education sector include the Michigan Schools in the Middle Program and the placement of “mid-tier” experience students and student teachers in school districts throughout Michigan.

26 www.cmucso.org/
27 www.schoolsinthemiddle.cmich.edu
28 www.ehs.cmich.edu/css/Midtier/MTHomePage.htm
29 www.tepd.cmich.edu/FieldExperiences/Centers/CENTERS.htm
CMU partners with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe

CMU has multiple collaborative projects with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe for educational and cultural programs. A partial list includes: the Michigan Story Festival, the Ziibiwing Cultural Center,30 the annual CMU Powwow,31 the Lem Tucker Speaker Series,32 the School of Music’s Opus fundraiser,33 and student mentoring through the Anishinaabe Athletic Youth Association. The CMU Research Corporation provides research services for tribal business enterprises.

CMU has collaborations with community organizations

CMU engages in numerous collaborations with community organizations. Some are ongoing, others are limited-time projects. One example of the latter was the terrorism response training exercise in summer 2004, organized jointly with the local Office of Emergency Management, the public health department, community hospital, and public safety agencies. Volunteers participated in a simulated smallpox immunization exercise, designed to model what would be needed to address needs for Isabella County if a biological terrorism event occurred.

On an ongoing basis, CMU partners with the city of Mt. Pleasant and the Mid-Michigan Development Corporation (MMDC) in the development of its Center for Applied Research and Technology (CART). This partnership has produced an impressive research park that has attracted various tenants. CART has had a very positive impact on the mid-Michigan community in terms of economic benefits and employment growth, in addition to supporting the university’s academic and research effort. The CMU Volunteer Center34 has partnership agreements with volunteer centers in Bay, Saginaw, Midland, Clare, and Ionia counties and the city of Detroit, where we serve very diverse communities, as well as with the local Volunteer Center of Isabella County.

CMU is responsive to the needs of those seeking continuing education opportunities

CMU offers a variety of credit and non-credit continuing education programs and outreach initiatives to external constituencies. Many of these are delivered through the ProfEd. Three illustrative examples are:

- The dietetics curriculum, offered through the Department of Human and Environmental Sciences, qualifies those individuals who have earned a degree and met internship requirements to sit for the licensed registered dietitian exam through the American Dietetics Association.

30 www.sagchip.org/ziibiwing/
31 www.cmich.edu/tour/events-activities/pages/pow-wow.htm
32 www.ccfa.cmich.edu/ltucker/index.html
33 www.mus.cmich.edu/opus.htm
34 secure.stulife.cmich.edu/vcentral/
The Department of Counseling and Special Education offers programs for those holding teaching certificates who wish to become school counselors. They undertake a 48-hour Master of Arts in Counseling degree to add a K-12 school counseling endorsement. Upon completion of the school counseling program students are required to take a state-mandated school counseling exam before they can apply for the endorsement. Approximately 99% of CMU graduates successfully pass this test. The M.A. in Counseling program enrolls approximately 450 students, both certified teachers as well as others seeking to become licensed professional counselors in the on-campus programs, and approximately 150 additional students in off-campus cohort programs through ProfEd.

The College of Business (CBA) offers continuing education opportunities for business professionals. One such offering is the annual summer Robert M. Perry School of Banking program, endorsed by the Michigan Bankers Association, qualifies those in the banking industry for continuing education credits.

CMU faculty and staff provide service as members of national, regional and local boards

Many CMU faculty and staff serve as representatives or officers of professional organizations in their fields. In some cases these are national organizations (e.g., National Council of Teachers of English, Recreation Sports Association), in other cases they are state or region based (e.g., Michigan Association of Registrars and Admission Officers, Michigan Council for Social Studies).

Locally, CMU is represented on virtually every non-profit board or agency in the county. The organizations include the Mt. Pleasant Schools Board of Education, the Mt. Pleasant Area Chamber of Commerce, the Mt. Pleasant Area Community Foundation, the United Way of Isabella County, Special Olympics Michigan, the Mid-Michigan Development Corporation, the Mt. Pleasant City Planning Commission, the Isabella County Board of Commissioners, and the Principal Shopping District Management Board.

President Michael Rao has been appointed by Michigan's governor to serve as a director of the Michigan Educational Trust. He is a member of the Mt. Pleasant Area Community Foundation Board of Trustees and the Downtown Development Board. He also serves as Chair of the Board of the Central Michigan University Research Corporation, on the Commission on Public University Renewal for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, served on the Cherry Commission on Higher Education (led by Michigan's lieutenant governor), and is vice-chair of the Cyber-state.org Board of Directors.

---

35 Professor Susan Steffel, ENG, member Board of Directors, 2002-present
36 Professor Renee Scott, TEPD, served as President, 2004-05
The president maintains open channels of communication

In order to ensure that CMU is responsive to its constituencies, President Rao has strongly emphasized communication and regularly shares information with both the internal and external communities through his presidential updates and open forums. He encourages people to communicate directly with him about issues, concerns and suggestions.

In the same manner that major donors expect to meet with the president before committing to a significant gift, so other university constituencies also warrant direct communication with the president, when and where practical. The Board of Trustees’ Presidential Review Committee recognized the president in its January 8, 2003, comprehensive review for his accomplishments in effective communication. The report said, in part:

“He has provided substantial leadership with his Web updates, vision statements, and annual setting of goals.”

Some of the president’s communication efforts are:

- Presidential “Updates” posted every four to five weeks on the President’s Office Web page. These are primarily open letters to the university community.
- Annual vision update and university goals that are posted on the President’s Office Web page.
- The president’s “Dear Friends” letter — three per year — that address university initiatives with alumni, community and legislative leaders and friends of the university.
- Campus-based open forums scheduled each semester for students, faculty, staff and community members for open discussion on university-related topics and issues.
- Annual meetings with Student Government Association, Residence Hall Assembly and other student organizations and “theme” focus groups with specifically defined and invited student groups.
- Periodic columns in CentraLight, the university magazine for alumni and friends.


- Guest columns on relevant university topics every three to four weeks in Central Michigan Life, the student newspaper.
- Meetings with Central Michigan Life editors at the beginning of each semester.
- Ongoing meetings in Lansing bringing CMU’s case for equitable funding to legislators and other state officials.
- Fund-raising events, meetings, and travel across the country supporting the university’s development and capital campaign efforts.

A focus group of community leaders was organized by the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee in August 2004. A finding was that CMU’s communication with local organizations has improved in recent years, which the group attributed to the example set by President Rao.

**EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 5C**

CMU has established successful collaborative partnerships with other institutions of higher learning, with K-12 school systems, and with community organizations. In establishing and maintaining these partnerships, CMU demonstrates its responsiveness to the constituents involved. In addition, communication and relationships with external constituencies have improved quite a bit in the past five years, especially with respect to the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, providing still further evidence of CMU’s actions that support successful engagement with external constituents.

**CORE COMPONENT 5D**

Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.

CMU has always had a strong emphasis on and been recognized for providing great service. Over the past several years we have increased emphasis on excellent service with training and recognition programs for faculty and staff, such as the Service Excellence Initiative. The focus in this chapter is on service to external constituencies, but most of these services benefit members of the CMU community as well.

**EVIDENCE THAT CMU SATISFIES THIS CORE COMPONENT**

Perhaps the best evidence that a service is valued is the extent to which is used. Other evidence includes the external recognition that a service receives and the degree to which donors support it. In this section we discuss some of this evidence for a few of the many services that CMU provides.
Use and attendance data show that CMU’s services are valued

Some service units keep detailed records of their patrons. Some are required to do so, such as the Speech/Language Clinic and the Hearing Clinic, which routinely counts a total of more than 5,000 patients a year. Fairly reliable records are also available for activities when a fee or admission price is involved. These range from such activities as summer sports and music camps to university theater productions, musical performances, athletic competitions, and contracted professional entertainment. On the other hand, many campus events are free and only estimates of attendance are available.

It is estimated that in 2003-04 more than 450,000 visitors came to campus to participate in one or more events. Some usage data have been mentioned previously in this chapter, such as those for Park Library and the summer programs offered by Residence Life. Other units that provided their data for this study are:

- University Events: coordinates numerous campus programs, such as the “Night of Louisiana” Cajun night, as well as CMU’s participation in events for the community such as the Beyond the Ponds music series, the Mt. Pleasant Summer Festival and winter Dickens Weekend.

- CMU Program Board: run by students, this unit brings a diverse offering of events to campus such as concerts, lectures, comedians, and films; they also sponsor events for opening weekend, homecoming, sibling’s weekend, black history month and other theme events on campus.

- On the Fly: a Residence Life-based student organization charged with organizing programs within the residence halls or primarily for residence hall students; co-sponsors some events with Program Board.

- Department of Athletics: runs CMU’s intercollegiate athletics programs, including competitions with spectators. Tickets must be purchased for the more popular events (e.g., men’s football, men’s and women’s basketball, baseball, championships), while other competitions are open to the public without charge.

- School of Music: offers musical performances for the CMU community and the public presented by CMU students, CMU faculty members and visiting artists.

- Michigan Story Festival: a cooperative project of CMU, the Mt. Pleasant community, and the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, this event celebrates storytelling through an array of interdisciplinary forms such as performances, exhibitions, workshops, and lectures.

38 www.chp.cmich.edu/academics/sh_clinics.htm
• The Department of Biology: operates two nature centers, Neithercut Woodland located about 40 miles northwest of Mt. Pleasant, and Beaver Island Biological Station in Lake Michigan.

The approximate numbers of persons that attended the events, both from CMU and the public, offered by the above organizations are given in Table 7-1 and Table 7-2.

CMU receives recognition from external organizations

The university frequently receives national and regional recognition, which indicates the quality of services provided. Some examples:

• U.S. News & World Report rated CMU in Tier 4, or among the top 248, of national universities and gave four programs national rankings: audiology (also named No. 1 program in Michigan), physician assistant, speech-language pathology, and physical therapy.

• Consumers Digest ranked CMU in 2004 as one of the 50 best values for public colleges and universities.

• Princeton Review listed CMU among the best midwestern colleges.

• Entrepreneur Magazine ranked CMU’s entrepreneur program as one of the top 100 such programs in the country.

• Mid-American Conference awarded CMU the 2004 MAC Academic Achievement Award for the university whose student-athletes have the highest cumulative grade point average; CMU earned the award for the third year in a row and for the seventh time in eight years.

• The Michigan Humanities Council named the 2003 Michigan Story Festival as one of the top 30 “Outstanding Humanities Projects” in the council’s 30-year history and submitted this as Michigan’s sole nominee for the national Helen and Martin Schwartz Prize.

CMU receives positive feedback on its service programs and volunteer activities

CMU routinely receives expressions of appreciation for services provided. A representative sample includes:

• The Saginaw Chippewa Tribe has cited the support of CMU in resolutions adopted by the tribal government:

  resolved that the partnership between Central Michigan University and the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe will serve as an invaluable foundation for the continued advancement and appreciation of global indigenous peoples and their wisdom.

  resolved that the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe and Central Michigan University continue to strengthen their cogent relationship for the...
enhancement of each other’s goals and visions and for the greater good of all residents of the region, state, and nation.\textsuperscript{41}

- Letters of support for the CMU Volunteer Center indicate that community organizations value the services that the center provides.

The joint effort put forth by the CMU Volunteer Center and United Way of Isabella County's Volunteer Center for the good of the community is a partnership valued by many agencies in the Isabella county area. As we work together, we ensure that each Isabella County citizen, both permanent resident and temporary, has an equal opportunity to engage in volunteer opportunities and every nonprofit agency gets the volunteer help they need and deserve. (Amy Town, Volunteer Center Director, United Way of Isabella County)

The CMU volunteer Center is critical to Big Brothers Big Sisters in many different ways. BBBS has four after school mentoring programs that occur during the school year. We simply could not staff them without our college volunteers. (Angela Stanton, Executive Director of Mt. Pleasant Big Brothers/Big Sisters)

The Mt. Pleasant Parks and Recreation Department has benefited from the hundreds of CMU students, faculty and staff that volunteer with our organization each year. The CMU Volunteer Center has partnered with our agency in a variety of ways including connecting volunteers to the daily opportunities with our after school program as well as with special volunteer one-day events such as Haunted forest, Easter Egg Scramble, Punt Pass and Kick, and Be My Neighbor Day. The Mt. Pleasant Parks and Recreation Department would have a tremendous challenge if we did not have the volunteer resources that the CMU volunteer Center provides to help meet the community’s needs. (Christopher Bundy, Director of Recreation, City of Mt. Pleasant)

Monetary contributions from constituencies show services are valued

A number of units that offer services to the public have fundraisers or formal support groups. The amount of money raised provides an indication that the services offered are valued. A few examples are:

- **Public Broadcasting:** CMU’s Public Radio and Television system engages in several fundraisers a year. Donors total approximately 14,000 annually, providing roughly $2 million in private support. This total has risen modestly over the last few years.

- **School of Music:** Opus\textsuperscript{42} is an annual combination dinner and musical performance fundraiser to benefit CMU’s music programs. The 2004 event had over 310 attendees at $125 per person and raised $28,400 for music programs.

- **Library:** The “Friends of the Libraries” is a group dedicated to providing support for CMU’s libraries. The organization has

\textsuperscript{41} www.diversity.cmich.edu/nativ/CMU=TribelResolution.pdf
\textsuperscript{42} www.mus.cmich.edu/opus.htm
1,800 members and raised $283,463 in 2003-04 and over $327,000 through March of this year.

- **Athletics:** The CMU Chippewa Club is an organization of alumni, friends, and companies with the primary mission of supporting CMU’s athletic programs. The club has about 1,900 members at membership levels from $100 to $5,000 and generated $614,303 in 2004-05 in financial support. An additional $297,000 was donated to this group through other fund-raising activities.

**CMU received constructive feedback from community leaders**

As part of this self-study, the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee organized a focus group of eight community leaders in August 2004 to gather input about CMU’s relationship to the local community. Their major points are summarized below (more detail is provided on the accreditation Web page and in the filed report), the first of which speaks to the value of CMU’s services to the local area.

- CMU plays an important role in the quality of life in the local area as well as in the local economy; this is important in giving our area a competitive edge when recruiting businesses, physicians, school teachers and attracting “quality families” (those with higher levels of education) to live in the area.

- CMU’s communication with local groups has improved in recent years (the efforts by President Rao were lauded), but there is concern the present level of contact may not continue and better communication is needed at lower levels.

- Quality of academic programs is good and improving, but more attention to writing skills is needed and our teacher preparation program is seen as having too much “red tape.”

- Many opportunities exist for CMU students and staff to participate in and benefit from the local community, but often these opportunities are missed. Internship programs need more standardized procedures and expectations for students and hosting organizations.

**EVALUATION OF CORE COMPONENT 5D**

As demonstrated in this section, the available evidence indicates our external constituencies place high value on the services CMU provides as well as the contributions to their communities made by CMU’s students, staff, and faculty. Students, faculty and staff also value the services they receive.

Nevertheless, our study revealed areas where improvements can be made. The self-study found that there is no university-wide evaluation process to measure and communicate how well service units are...
performing, to identify if duplication of efforts exist, or to determine if there are unfilled needs that could be provided. A systematic evaluation process is needed along with a dissemination plan to share that information with the campus. Specific feedback from community leaders indicated that improvements in internship management and teacher preparation programs are needed, that there seem to be many missed opportunities for CMU-community collaborations, and that stronger communication efforts are needed at levels below the president.

CMU’s current financial situation and the potential that it could get worse in the future threatens our ability to continue to provide the current levels of service both for students and our external constituents. With current staffing levels, faculty and staff are being expected to do more and more and this will likely impact their ability to volunteer and serve on organizations outside of CMU. In addition, even though community leaders see areas for improvement and expansion, tight budgets may force CMU to eliminate or cut back on the programs offered, begin charging for various events or services that are now free, or increase the fees that do exist. There will likely be increased need to identify priorities and have long-term planning.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Our basic finding is that CMU excels in service and engagement, and this chapter discussed only a small portion of the activities that occur. The university is responsive to its constituent needs and makes good use of the resources that it has to provide useful services for both internal and external constituents. Specific findings are:

**STRENGTHS**

1. **Service and Engagement:** CMU provides a wide range of valued services and cultural opportunities to the local community, region and citizens of Michigan.

2. **Partnerships:** The university has developed valuable solid partnerships with external entities.

3. **Dedicated Campus:** Faculty and staff are dedicated to giving back to their professions and to the community; students are strong contributors to the community.

4. **Attention to Service:** The Service Excellence Program has led to increased attention to service.

5. **Assessment:** Most assessment of service occurs at the program level, rather than through a centralized process. CMU’s decentralized process facilitates effective change.

6. **Communication:** Communication and relationships with external constituencies have improved. This has facilitated the development of a variety of cooperative programs with outside entities.
CONCERNS

1. **Budget:** 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.

2. **Planning:** There is the potential for duplicating services or offering competing programs because of the lack of centralized planning and coordination.

3. **Planning:** Lack of a comprehensive long-term planning process inhibits systematic development of programs to meet future demands. Instead, immediate problems become the primary focus.

4. **Evaluation:** CMU lacks a systematic evaluation process to determine how we are doing and a dissemination plan to share that information with the campus.

5. **Competition:** Maintaining competitiveness in an increasingly competitive marketplace needs to be part of CMU’s long-range planning.
CHAPTER 8
SPECIAL EMPHASIS

Making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence
MAKING THE TRANSITION

CMU chose to pursue the “special emphasis” option within its accreditation self-study with dual purposes in mind. The first is to educate the campus community about the issues that confront us as we pursue a new vision. For this audience, the chapter begins with background information so that it can be read without reference to the rest of the self-study; the sections contain “discussion points” designed to stimulate much needed conversations. The second purpose is to seek the advice and counsel of the HLC consultant-evaluators on strategies most likely to foster success in pursuing our vision. For these, the discussion points summarize issues on which we need advice and the narrative provides the context.

BACKGROUND

A Special Emphasis Self-Study is an option made available to accredited, mature institutions that have a recent history of decennial review in conjunction with their comprehensive evaluation visits that did not result in any major interim monitoring. In this option, an institution seeks Higher Learning Commission authorization for a focus in its self-study on one or more issues that are critical for the realization of the institution’s mission and vision.

Early in the self-study process it became clear how much the nature of CMU has changed since the last accreditation review in 1996. The university has long had a focus on teaching excellence and has been a leader in off-campus education. These continue, but the past decade has seen an increasing emphasis on faculty and student scholarship and on doctoral education. CMU now has ten doctoral programs, which has led to CMU’s being classified as a Carnegie doctoral/research-intensive institution. The enhanced research activity has brought more grant-writing and external recognition. The changing nature of CMU led the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee (ASSSC) to pursue the idea for a special emphasis on a topic related to the changes. Members of the ASSSC met with the HLC staff liaison and consulted others about the special emphasis option during the 2004 Annual Meeting in Chicago.

A number of possible topics were proposed, discussed within the ASSSC, and with the president and provost. There was general agreement that one of the most significant issues facing CMU was the changing expected balance between teaching and scholarly activities for faculty members.

The Board of Trustees adopted a revised vision statement in April 2004: “CMU will be a nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, applied research, and public service.” The phrase “applied research” was changed to the more inclusive “research and creative activity” in March 2005. The new vision statement expresses the undergraduate teaching, graduate education, and scholarship
expectations that have been part of the university’s mission for quite some time, and which were reaffirmed when the mission statements were last reviewed and endorsed by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees in 2002, but the reference to national prominence indicates the changing focus. Building on the new vision statement, the formal topic for the special emphasis was adopted: “Making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence.” A set of questions to more clearly define the issues and guide the discussions was then developed.

**ELIGIBILITY FOR A SPECIAL EMPHASIS SELF-STUDY**

Collaboration between the institution and the Higher Learning Commission is essential for a Special Emphasis self-study. As documented in other parts of this report, CMU is a mature institution without significant accreditation issues. In accord with HLC procedures, at the start of the 2004 fall semester CMU submitted a preliminary request for a special emphasis self-study that:

- provided background data (i.e., Carnegie classification, accreditation history, source of controlling support, etc.);
- showed the relationship between the identified special emphasis and the institution’s mission;
- documented institutional consensus and support for the special emphasis area chosen;
- provided evidence that the institution has made progress relative to challenges identified by the team that conducted the last comprehensive evaluation visit; and
- provided evidence that the institution has adequate financial resources and a comprehensive planning and budgeting process.

After reviewing this document, the HLC staff liaison for CMU agreed to review a formal submission for an agreement between the university and the commission. A subcommittee was appointed to coordinate the self-study’s special emphasis. The liaison made a follow-up visit to the campus in October 2004 during which he had further detailed conversations about the special emphasis option with the Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee, the new Special Emphasis Subcommittee, the president, and the provost.

**FINAL DEFINITION OF THE SPECIAL EMPHASIS**

CMU has a unionized faculty and the current collective bargaining agreement terminated on June 30, 2005. Thus, consideration of a special emphasis coincided with the preliminary stages of preparing for bargaining. A number of the issues relevant to the special emphasis, such as appropriate faculty workloads and reward structures, are mandatory topics of bargaining and subject to labor law. Consequently,
prior to the formation of the special emphasis subcommittee and the submission of the preliminary request to the HLC, the chair of the ASSSC consulted with the president of the CMU Faculty Association (FA) to see if the FA anticipated any problems with the proposed special emphasis request. He requested that a member of the FA Board of Directors be nominated to serve on the subcommittee as a liaison and to ensure that the committee avoided areas that are the domain of bargaining. The FA initially had no objections to a special emphasis self-study and nominated one of its board members, Robert Lee, for the subcommittee and he was appointed.

The FA later voiced concerns about the specific nature of the guiding questions in the request that mentioned faculty working conditions: workload, reward structure, external funding. Some reasoned that their inclusion in the formal agreement between CMU and the HLC for a special emphasis would lead to recommendations from the HLC on topics that must be bargained. The FA asked that the special emphasis option not be formalized as in the preliminary request and Professor Lee suspended his committee participation until the issue could be resolved. At the same time, the special emphasis committee requested that an additional guiding question related to defining national prominence be added.

A series of discussions involving CMU and the FA, CMU and the HLC staff liaison, and the ASSSC took place. These eventually resulted in a formal request for a special emphasis self-study that included (1) language that makes it clear that CMU will seriously consider, but would be under no obligation to implement, any HLC recommendations and (2) a somewhat revised set of guiding questions. The language was submitted on January 4 and it was accepted by the HLC and a formal agreement signed on January 10 of this year.

THE SPECIAL EMPHASIS SUBCOMMITTEE’S WORK

The Special Emphasis Subcommittee was appointed early in the Fall 2004 semester by the provost. Members were recommended by the ASSSC and the Academic Senate after seeking self-nominations and nominations by faculty, Academic Senate members, deans, and the CMU Faculty Association.

The Special Emphasis Subcommittee was charged with identifying the issues that CMU might face, and would wish to seek consultation on, in making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence. The charge explicitly proscribed the subcommittee from offering recommendations, solutions, or preferred models for addressing issues in order to avoid entering into areas exclusively reserved for collective bargaining.

The subcommittee met weekly during the fall semester and prepared a report on its findings. The report was presented to the ASSSC and formed the basis for this chapter. The subcommittee was given the set of

questions to address that guided its discussions and preparation of the report. It was understood that these same “guiding questions” would be provided to the HLC as ones for which CMU seeks advice.

The subcommittee noted in its report that every effort was made to present the most important issues in a manner to reflect the sentiments of the CMU community, even when one or more subcommittee members may not have personally agreed with some of the issues. There was consensus among the committee’s members on all parts of the report, with the exception of some issues related to the question concerning timely decision making and shared governance (Question 7). The Subcommittee expressed the desire that its report “be used as a starting point in CMU’s pursuit of consultative advice from the HLC to help guide the university in its decisions as to if and how it should proceed in its pursuit of its vision.”

THE CONTEXT OF THE SPECIAL EMPHASIS TOPIC

Before addressing specific issues, it is appropriate to describe the context within which the topic “Making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence” is framed. In particular, we briefly describe the environment for scholarship at CMU.

Academic scholarship is most frequently evidenced by public presentation, which not only signifies the completion of a scholarly endeavor but also makes it available to others within and outside the academic community. Common forms of public release include journal or conference articles, professional presentations, books, grant proposals, copyrights and patent applications, and artistic performances. External assessment demonstrates to the satisfaction of peers that high quality standards are met.

At a research university (e.g., the University of Michigan), faculty work under very different conditions than do those at CMU. Their rewards are structured more for research than for teaching and, consequently, they usually spend less effort and time on teaching. They typically have lighter teaching loads (e.g., 1-4 small enrollment, upper-level and graduate-level courses per academic year), have graduate student assistants (to grade exams and assignments and, often, to teach portions of courses) and have fewer interactions with undergraduate students than do faculty at CMU. The environment of lower teaching responsibilities provides faculty at research institutions with the most important ingredient for scholarly activity — time.

In contrast, Central Michigan University is a comprehensive teaching and research institution. Our recruiting literature and discussions with prospective students emphasize that we are much different from large research universities. Regarding research, faculty members do not have the specified levels of publication or external funding, as one might at a research institution. They also have lower levels of research support.

3 Fairweather, 1993
Nevertheless, CMU is seeing a growing expectation of scholarly activity, especially for promotion and tenure. Some indications are:

- Research and creative endeavors, particularly activities involving undergraduates, is now featured prominently in our marketing efforts.
- Departments that have recently revised their bylaws, which set promotion and tenure requirements, have placed greater focus on research leading to publication.
- Since 1994, all new faculty in the sciences have had clauses in their initial letters of appointment stating that, as an expectation for tenure, they must write competitive proposals for external funding. There has been no requirement that they actually receive funding, but they certainly have to try. This practice has recently been extended to a few units outside the sciences. Most recently, for the first time some letters of appointment for new faculty (in one department) have included the receipt of external funding as a condition for tenure.

CMU’s academic departments and colleges with their varied faculties, programs, and students are quite heterogeneous. The amount and level of scholarship varies widely, and includes a few internationally-known researchers. Furthermore, scholarly activity manifests itself in many forms, appropriate to the specific disciplines. Creative and artistic activities, such as musical performance or writing and producing plays, are considered the equivalent of research and the scholarly expectation for CMU faculty is commonly referred to as “research and creative activity.”

THE GUIDING QUESTIONS

Seven questions were developed by the ASSSC to help guide and shape the campus discussion of the topic of fostering the transition to an institution with an increased emphasis on scholarship. These were incorporated into the agreement between CMU and the HLC for a special emphasis self-study. The agreement states:

“Some of the questions to which CMU seeks answers are:

1. What are appropriate and realistic indicators of national prominence for CMU?
2. How do we maintain our historical emphasis on quality undergraduate education as we seek national prominence both for teaching and for research and other creative activity?
3. How do we ensure support for our small set of doctoral programs and assure that these represent appropriate areas of focus for CMU given its faculty, resource base and markets for potential students?
4. How do we maintain a shared commitment to undergraduate programs and promote substantive faculty involvement with
students at all levels as more focus is placed on research and other creative activity?

5. Are infrastructure changes needed to accomplish the transition to increased scholarship and national prominence? If so, what are they and how are they best accomplished?

6. What are the barriers and challenges, as well as the opportunities, related to achieving increased scholarship and national prominence, and what are reasonable expectations for faculty or for departments? In addressing this question, the self-study will include workload, reward structures, and external funding among the topics discussed.

7. If changes are desired, how do we encourage timely decision-making within our strong shared governance structure, including collective bargaining?

CMU desires to devote a portion of its current self-study to these and related questions. It also desires consultation and advice from the Higher Learning Commission Consultant Evaluators on these questions through the special emphasis portion of its accreditation review."

As mentioned, the exact wording of the questions was a subject of discussion among CMU, the CMU Faculty Association, and the Higher Learning Commission. The underlined sections show wording proposed by the HLC and agreed to by CMU and the ASSSC but to which the FA had some objections. Given how the questions evolved, the language used by the subcommittee was in some cases slightly different from that finally adopted.

The Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee asked that the Special Emphasis Subcommittee consider these questions not only from a CMU perspective but also in the context of the practices and standards at other institutions classified as doctoral/research-intensive. The focus of the subcommittee’s work was to identify and describe the issues with which CMU must deal, not to propose solutions for problems nor make recommendations for changes.

The issues raised by each question are discussed in the sections that follow. The sections contain one or more “discussion points” — key issues that CMU must address in pursuit of its vision. These discussion points were intended to initiate debate by the CMU community and, in fact, discussions and data gathering for some has already begun. While CMU will eagerly hear advice from the Higher Learning Commission on any of the issues raised, there is no expectation for the consultant-evaluators to address them.
QUESTION 1
What are appropriate and realistic indicators of national prominence for CMU?

The vision of achieving increased national prominence depends in part on defining what national prominence means. This will vary among the stakeholders, and the different meanings may suggest very different ways to pursue increased national prominence. Unless all understand the multiple ways in which national prominence has meaning and a common understanding is achieved, it is likely that a program of change to increase prominence will:

- be pursued in ways that are at cross-purposes,
- privilege some directions of change at the expense of other valuable components of a CMU education, or
- create resistance when some elements of the university feel threatened by the proposed changes.

The first steps, then, are to identify who the stakeholders are, what their primary interests are, and how a change in emphasis may affect them, and then to identify the potential gains and risks within the context of the criteria used to define national prominence.

1.1 THE STAKEHOLDERS AND HOW A CHANGE IN EMPHASIS MIGHT AFFECT THEM

CMU is an institution composed of many individuals, some for whom change in emphasis will be welcomed and some who will resist it. Before embarking on a process of change, we should understand who is affected and how and why they are affected.

Major stakeholders are the students, the faculty, administrators, the support staff, and the Board of Trustees (BOT). The different groups, as well as the individuals within a group, will have different views of the importance of increased scholarship and national prominence. Faculty may see it as a way to improve education in their disciplines, students as increasing recognition of CMU and thus the value of their degrees, and administrators as a key to attracting more funding. Further, the ideas of one group may conflict and threaten the interests of another. As examples, increased emphasis on faculty research might reduce student access to faculty, or the redirection of resources to scholarship might lead to elimination of some student support services and their positions. It is therefore important to consider what national prominence can mean, how the different meanings can be construed in positive and negative ways in a program of change, and to anticipate ways to embrace the complexity of possibilities in coordinating multiple ways of becoming excellent without sacrificing, marginalizing, alienating, or discounting the important contributions each of the many stakeholders can make.
1.2 **POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF NATIONAL PROMINENCE**

CMU’s vision is to achieve increased national prominence as the result of notable work in academic programs, research and creative endeavors, and public service, and for being an institution with integrity. The first step is to define, in this context, what will be the indicators of national prominence.

There are many criteria that can be adopted. Level of research activity, number of prominent graduate programs, reputation for excellence in undergraduate instruction, innovative curricula, the offering of a unique academic experience or a combination of several of these are some that have been used. Criteria could also be how the institution compares to comparable educational institutions or universities that we aspire to emulate or based on external ratings by others, such as the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings.

It is important to recognize that an institution’s reputation, or prominence, may also be affected — either positively or negatively — by such factors as the social climate on campus, quality of student life, a “flagship” program (e.g., a well-regarded law school), prominent alumni, or athletic achievement. We will consider only those indicators of national prominence that are based on academics and are of general application. Given special emphasis focus, we particularly consider criteria that involve increased scholarship as a means to achieve more national prominence.

### 1.2.1 Using external comparisons

One commonly mentioned criterion is external rankings, the best known being those of *U.S. News and World Report*. Table 8-1 shows CMU’s ranking for the past four years. In theory, CMU could assess where we stand in terms of the ranking factors, measure the gap between where we are and where we want to be, and design policies to get us there. Some of the factors that would improve our ranking, particularly academic reputation among peers, do indeed relate to levels of research and scholarly activity.

In practice, while there are some actions we could take that could improve our *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, many of the ranking factors are directly or indirectly related to institutional resources, a factor mostly beyond our control. It is not clear how much increasing research and scholarship, especially if it were at the expense of other areas, would improve our ranking. More importantly, letting others frame our concept of national prominence runs the risk that institutional decisions will be driven by factors unrelated to academic excellence or our basic mission. The desire to move up in ranking could come to
dominate our institutional direction and lead, in the words of Colby et al., to the “commodification of education.”

An alternate comparative criterion for measuring increased national prominence is to use externally generated data, such as from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in which CMU has participated for the past several years. The survey results could be used to self-assess our performance, compare it to a selected set of benchmark institutions, and set our own standards for increased national prominence. Indeed, CMU has already begun to move down this path. A set of 11 benchmark institutions of similar characteristics to CMU has been identified. Strategies for enhancing academic programs, increasing scholarly activity, and strengthening our public service along with indicators of progress have been developed.

Discussion point:
How concerned should we be with external rankings, specifically, those of *U.S. News and World Report*?

1.2.2 The risks of pursuing a limited notion of national prominence

The topic of special emphasis is “Making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence.” This might suggest a relationship — the way for a university to be nationally prominent is to develop a high profile for research activity. While faculty scholarship level is indeed one of the more obvious indicators of national prominence, there are significant risks in adopting one single measure for national prominence, such as research.

The first issue to be considered if more focus is placed on scholarship is the possible effect on teaching. Boyer, in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, noted that when chief academic officers were surveyed about how the balance between teaching, research and service was changing, only 5% reported that the move at their institution had been toward teaching. At doctoral institutions 56% of the academic officers reported a move toward research and away from teaching and service. If faculty reward

---

4 “Competition for resources, including faculty with distinguished scholarly records, grants and other funding, and high-achieving students, has produced a climate in which resource enhancement and reputation building are treated as ends in themselves. Colleges and universities increasingly define their worth with reference to their relative position in status hierarchies that are most starkly embodied in the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. Although there is a growing awareness of the incongruity between this stance and the fundamental educational and service missions of U.S. higher education (Astin, 1997, 2000; Sullivan, 2001), it is almost impossible for any institution to “disarm” unilaterally; so survival or at least maintenance of one’s position in the pecking order is believed to depend on participation in this competitive, zero-sum game. Of course this competition for prestige is most acute at research universities and other selective institutions, but competition for resources is equally important at every level of the status hierarchy. When strategies for competing successfully are framed in terms of “satisfying the customer,” they too contribute to the commodification of higher education.” (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003, pp. 41-42).


6 Boyer (1990), p. 29, table 4
systems evolve to place less emphasis on teaching relative to research, the quality of teaching may suffer.

The effect of increased research emphasis on a university’s teaching mission has not been resolved, but recent work suggests that administrations must indeed pay careful attention to policies and procedures on faculty rewards. In a 1997 Carnegie Foundation survey “almost half the faculty at research universities said that teaching counted more toward advancement than it had five years earlier (and large minorities at virtually all other types of institutions said the same thing). However, even larger numbers reported that research demands have been rising.” Policies for faculty advancement are being rewritten to place greater weight on teaching, but many faculty “perceive a disconnect between the new policies and the actual practices of tenure, promotion, and compensation. Furthermore, when emphasis on teaching is increased as the importance of scholarly productivity is also going up, the pressures on faculty can become overwhelming.” If there is tension between research activity and teaching in research extensive institutions, it would likely be even more acute in an institution like CMU that has only recently achieved Doctoral/Research-Intensive status.

Measuring all faculty, departments, and colleges, primarily in terms of research productivity would devalue important contributions made by the many other types of scholarly and creative activities on campus and likely cause divisiveness. Also, emphasis on research runs the risk of creating the perception that the institution is neglecting its basic mission. The faculty are seen as not committed to undergraduate education and the institution as having little interest in educating for responsible citizenship.8

Discussion Point:

How do we ensure that our vision of becoming “a nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, research and creative activity, and public service” does not focus only on the research aspect of achieving prominence?

1.2.3 Using multiple indicators of national prominence

A process that coordinates diverse indicators of national prominence holds out the possibility of embracing the varied contributions everyone across the university can make. However, to achieve this we would need to reach agreement on several related questions: (1) Who will be our audiences for our claims to national prominence? (2) What will be our

8 “As American higher education has evolved from the 18th century to the present, moral and civic concerns have moved from its center, inherent in the very concept of a college education, to its margins, segregated from the rest of academic life. If these trends prevail, education for responsible citizenship could be squeezed out altogether, at least in some kinds of institutions. At the very least, these shifts in the landscape of higher education have resulted in a contemporary context that presents serious impediments to advancing both moral and civic education and liberal education more broadly. These impediments include . . . faculty reward systems that place relatively little emphasis on teaching relative to research . . . .” Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003.
criteria for national prominence? (3) What indicators will we use to support our claims for national recognition? Answering these questions will raise awareness of the multiple stakeholders in the process of change and the multiple ways of achieving excellence that will lead to prominence.

It will be important to remember that achieving increased national prominence will probably mean something different for each college, particularly in the area of research and creative activity. The institutional indicators used to evaluate progress should therefore be flexible enough to reflect those differences, and allowance made for college-specific indicators that can cover the wide variety of scholarly and other activities. The CMU community needs to ask each other what it is we would like to accomplish in this transition and to appreciate the many different answers to that question.

In any event, our claims to national prominence should be based on some kind of intentionality, either one concept shared across the institution or diversely defined concepts coordinated for maximum effect. At least those institutions that have garnered praise from the AAHE community seem to reflect some kind of focus on what kind of an educational institution they were trying to create.

Discussion Point:
How do we best coordinate diverse notions of national prominence to take advantage of the multiple forms of excellence that can be achieved in a transition to more nationally prominent university?

1.3 DECIDING ON THE CRITERIA TO BE USED

Before planning how to move CMU toward increased national prominence, it is important to clearly define the criteria that will be used to determine prominence. In some cases, the activities pursued under one understanding of national prominence will privilege some aspects of academic quality while disconfirming other equally important ones. In selecting the criteria we should discuss the implications.

It is also important to keep firmly in mind that the pursuit of national prominence should not become an end in itself. The Vision Planning surveys revealed that most at CMU feel the main purpose of increasing scholarly activity should be to improve the educational experiences of our students, not to gain national recognition. This principle was affirmed by the Board of Trustees, which agreed to “communicate that national prominence is not an end in itself, but a reputation based on the type and quality of work that deserves and results in national prominence.” If this is forgotten, CMU may be tempted to seek prominence through non-academic activities, such as research centers or athletics, or to make decisions driven mainly by the criteria for national rankings.

Crafting an agreed-to concept of national prominence for CMU can be difficult and time consuming, but has the potential to unite the campus. Cohesion can occur first through the process of deciding what we mean by “more nationally prominent” and then through the collective efforts to achieve a common goal — actually becoming a more nationally prominent university. The first steps have already taken place. Campuswide discussions and opinion surveys during the 2005 Spring semester led to CMU 2010, which gives strategies for pursuing our vision and identifies possible key performance indicators to monitor progress.

The challenge now will be to help the CMU community understand why we are pursuing such a vision. Related to this is the pragmatic matter of ensuring that we incorporate into the plan the different aspects of “national prominence” so that efforts at change are embraced, facilitated, and implemented for maximum effectiveness. Failure to address this issue will result in unanticipated consequences of diminished prominence in some areas that are of interest to some stakeholders. Building support for a vision that all can share will diminish criticism, reduce competition for scarce resources, and prevent holdouts from sapping time and energy from moving forward. It is important that all stakeholders be involved in this process.

Discussion Points:

What should be our criteria for “national prominence” given the resources, both fiscal and human, we have available? Who should determine the criteria to be used?

Are the indicators that have been proposed appropriate ones for measuring progress as we pursue national prominence?

How do we craft an understanding of national prominence that builds on our traditional strengths, addresses our weaknesses, is sensitive to the many ways of being excellent, advances the interests of all stakeholders, and pursues the opportunities before us?

1.4 THE TEMPTATION TO TRY TO DO TOO MUCH

There is a strong temptation for a university to try to do too much. First, there are many marks of national prominence that any institution would like to say are its characteristics. The level of research is a prime example, which has led to the increasing emphasis on research that is occurring at many institutions. There is the natural desire to try and address more and more of the recognition factors. This can lead to overload.

Second, those not cognizant of the day-to-day activities of faculty, staff, and/or administrators may assume that the campus community can simply do more, such as increase research productivity. However, initiatives aimed at achieving other institutional goals have already decreased available time. For example, in addition to their traditional teaching and research roles, faculty are now often expected to meet with prospective students, cultivate contacts for their college development officer, assist with public relations activities, and incorporate new technology and pedagogical methods into their courses.
Pursuing too many initiatives can be a more acute problem at institutions like CMU. Faculty members are asked to be as productive, as excellent, and as engaged as those at a prominent university but without comparable infrastructure and resources. The budgets are smaller than at research institutions and the consequences of any budget difficulties are more serious. Reducing support staff, which makes employees process their own paperwork and resolve questions “on-line,” or having faculty teach larger sections are examples of budget-driven decisions that reduce time available for other activities. Also, CMU’s culture of strong shared governance at CMU means a heavy committee burden. The cumulative effect on morale threatens the commitment on the part of CMU faculty to pursue a vision of greater national prominence.

There are always multiple areas of interest to an institution. This leads to two key questions:

- How do we choose the areas to be pursued and prioritize those selected? CMU’s new vision of moving toward a more nationally prominent institution naturally produces conflicting priorities. What is more important: efforts to improve student learning (assessment, capstone courses, improved pedagogy, service learning), activities to strengthen the institution (student recruitment, fund raising), or activities to raise the level of scholarship (research, grant writing)? Can the multiple interests and initiatives be coordinated and/or integrated into a coherent action plan for transitioning to a more nationally prominent institution?

- Should the work on different priorities be divided? A significant number at CMU feel that dividing faculty responsibilities would not be a good idea. Some tasks require the collective efforts of all faculty. There is the fear that some faculty may be relegated to “service” tracks for which there would be fewer reward possibilities, particularly if research excellence becomes the main priority. On the other hand, some feel that having similar teaching responsibilities for those with significantly different levels of research activity is very inequitable.

The answers to these questions involve the components of the faculty workload. At CMU, for example, institutional commitments to assessing student learning and to developing capstone courses have excellent potential for increasing the quality of education, but they require faculty time that could otherwise be devoted to class preparation and/or research.10

10 CMU is not alone in facing such challenges. From Colby et al., “It is obvious that the more engaging pedagogies and more authentic assessments being advocated require a greater investment of faculty time and attention. Educational leaders are well aware that these efforts are hampered by some of the traditions surrounding faculty roles and by higher education’s reluctance to recognize, assess, and reward the considerable intellectual work entailed in curricular and pedagogical reform (Schneider & Shoenberg, 1998).” (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003, pp. 45-46).
Discussion Points:
Can we balance the competing interests or will we be required to choose some over others? If we must choose, who will decide?

In setting our priorities, how should we decide what we will no longer do or support?

1.5 SECTION SUMMARY

The new vision statement commits CMU to change. The transition from a regional institution to one with a national focus will involve making scholarship a greater priority and part of the campus culture. This in turn will require that financial support be dedicated to promising programs and faculty with the goal that some will eventually achieve national prominence.

The challenge will be that it costs money, and it will be difficult to build support for change in times when financial resources are restricted, especially when the investments will affect only some and some are not committed to the vision. Aligning resources and rewards with sensible priorities developed collaboratively across campus can build the needed support. Developing a vision that all can share diminishes criticism, reduces competition for scarce resources, and prevents holdouts from sapping the faculty community’s time and effort toward moving in the direction of change.

There are a number of issues that confront the university in this process. These are discussed in the subsequent sections of this chapter. Here we have pointed out the fundamental importance of considering the effects of change, clearly identifying acceptable criteria for national prominence and of avoiding the temptation of trying to do too much.

It seems essential that we ask how other schools have made the transition in this area, how long it took, and what kinds of actions they pursued to initiate greater research activity on the part of faculty. Further, it seems important to ask what the costs of doing so were. For example, grant writing is a time-consuming activity that necessarily trades off with other priorities. How were the activities to pursue the different priorities sequenced or balanced and what short- and long-term tradeoffs were made? Was the transition accomplished under similar financial constraints that currently face CMU? Would they make the same decisions if they had another chance? Did the changes they initiated create unanticipated consequences, and, if so, were these favorable or unfavorable? If unfavorable, how did they respond? In short, what lessons can we learn from others who have completed a similar process of change?

Discussion Points:
How do we manage the ambiguity, anxiety, frustration and resistance associated with change?
QUESTION 2 AND QUESTION 4
How do we maintain our historical emphasis on quality undergraduate education as we seek national prominence both for teaching and for research and other creative activity?

How do we maintain a shared commitment to undergraduate programs and promote substantive faculty involvement with students at all levels as more focus is placed on research and other creative activity?

Question 2 and Question 4 are closely linked, and the subcommittee elected to discuss these together. Their report states that, asked the first question, many CMU faculty members would respond “we can’t.” One often hears that it is almost impossible to conduct both high-level research and maintain high-quality teaching at CMU given current conditions and resources.

CMU has a strong tradition of attention to undergraduate education and almost all at CMU feel this should continue. Further, most feel the faculty should not be divided into some who focus primarily on graduate education and others who are responsible for the undergraduate programs. Rather, there should be a mutually shared commitment to undergraduate teaching. This leads to the second question. Many CMU faculty members would respond that if we wish to maintain, and even improve, the commitment to our undergraduate programs while at the same time increase research activity, we must find ways to increase the time available for research by CMU faculty.

2.1 PRESENT FACULTY WORKLOAD

The CMU contract states that “the instructional portion of a faculty member’s full-time work load consists of nine (9) to twelve (12) credit hours per semester as determined by the department.” This generally means three standard courses of three contact hours a week each semester. In some cases professors teach four classes a semester and in some disciplines the load includes such assignments as laboratory supervision or private music lessons. Time for preparation, grading, recordkeeping, and keeping course material current vary considerably, but typically significantly exceed the time in the classroom. Teaching a new preparation and employing active-learning pedagogies have even larger time commitments. Added to this must be the time required to stay current in one’s field.

In practice, CMU’s standard teaching load combined with our student-focused culture leaves little time for research. Faculty members who are

11 The original intention was that the second question would deal with maintaining the quality of undergraduate programs as emphasis on research increases, while the fourth question would focus on both how to keep all faculty involved with undergraduate education, especially those significantly engaged in research, and how to encourage the involvement of undergraduates, as well as graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, in research.
considered successful teachers and also have active research agendas must work long hours during the academic year — 60 hours a week is not uncommon\textsuperscript{12} — and often full-time on their research (even if not funded) during the summer months and holiday breaks. Some feel the need to cut corners in order to keep up with both their teaching and research commitments; for example, they may not fully adhere to the “Writing across the Curriculum” requirements when teaching a general education course because they do not have time to grade essays for large introductory courses and still have time for research.

Other faculty members struggle to provide their students with a quality education by requiring writing, designing innovative courses, using more effective but time-intensive teaching methods, and making themselves readily available to students outside of class; these often feel they sacrifice research opportunities to do so. Both types of faculty members commonly say that they have great ideas and motivation for research, but they don’t have the time to do it.

\subsection*{2.2 INCREASING THE SIZE OF THE FACULTY}

The most obvious way to increase the time devoted to research would be to decrease the student-to-faculty ratio. In the “vision planning” survey, 83\% of the faculty agreed that the current student-to-faculty ratio is too high.\textsuperscript{13} Indeed, CMU’s student-to-faculty ratio (23:1) places us last compared to our 12 benchmark institutions, as shown in Figure 5.4. The midpoint for the comparator institutions is 18.5 students per faculty member, with several institutions having ratios less than 16 and the highest besides CMU at 21.8.

In practice, reducing the ratio almost surely means increasing the size of the faculty while keeping program enrollments constant. Also, because additional faculty members require money, of course, across-the-board increases would seem to be impossible given the current budget situation. This option, therefore, would seem to require a selection of the programs in which to invest. Clear selection criteria are critical if this approach is to be workable. \textit{CMU 2010} calls for a study of this issue in the 2005-06 year.

\textbf{Discussion Point:}

What should CMU do achieve its commitment made in \textit{CMU 2010}\textsuperscript{14} to lower the student/faculty ratio? In particular, can we (1) hire more faculty and (2) cap enrollments?

\subsection*{2.3 DIFFERENTIATION IN WORKLOADS}

Another approach would be to selectively increase time for research — allow some faculty who excel in scholarship to spend more time doing research, while most would focus on the teaching aspect.

\textsuperscript{12} Fairweather (1996) found that typical faculty workloads are near 55 hours a week.
\textsuperscript{13} www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VisionPlanning/CMUVisionSurveyResults.pdf, Question 11.
\textsuperscript{14} www.planning.cmich.edu/VisionPlanApproved.pdf
CMU faculty members have very mixed feelings about the wisdom of a formalized differential workload system. Most agree this would increase research activity, but many fear it would also lead to second-class status and fewer reward possibilities for those concentrating on teaching. Creating an equitable reward structure could be difficult given that research excellence is generally easier to document than teaching excellence. Another risk would be that new faculty hires might be based largely on research prowess. If aptitude for and interest in teaching were not also considered, our reputation for quality teaching might suffer given that these persons would still have undergraduate teaching responsibilities. Departments have significant control over faculty workloads through their bylaws, and a few departments are experimenting with differential workloads, but it is too soon to see how successful these will be.

Discussion Point:
Are differential workloads appropriate for CMU?

2.4 INTEGRATING TEACHING AND RESEARCH

A way some faculty have successfully improved both student learning and research productivity is to involve students in research and/or to incorporate research into courses. CMU has encouraged student research. There has been a dramatic increase in student-centered research, as evidenced by the number of student publications and projects at SRCEE over the past decade. To be effective this approach requires support, such as funds for student research activities and presentations and student access to laboratories and other facilities. We see the possibility that CMU could be nationally recognized as a place where students are involved in research. The downside to this strategy is significant time may be required to assure the quality of the research and to train the student participants. The time commitment could be quite demanding should research participation become a requirement for all students.

Discussion Points:
Should load credit be given for supervision of student research?
Should formal incentives be offered for faculty members who take on student researchers?
Could student-centered research be our niche area?
2.5 OTHER POTENTIAL WAYS TO INCREASE TIME FOR RESEARCH

Several other ways that might increase the time for research at CMU have been mentioned from time to time.

2.5.1 Increasing class size

Theoretically, a way to increase time for faculty would be to increase class enrollments so that fewer sections would be required to be taught. In practice, larger classes require either that more hours be spent on them to maintain quality or that less attention be given to students and academic quality be lowered. Many of the most effective teaching methods are only practical, or even possible, in smaller classes. CMU already has a high student-to-faculty ratio (23:1) and thus moving to larger classes would be at odds with CMU’s goal of raising academic quality. It appears that only small gains in time would be produced by going to larger class sizes.

2.5.2 Raising academic standards

Another possible strategy for reducing the time a faculty member must devote to teaching might be to raise the level of the students. Those students who struggle typically require more faculty attention than those who do well.

An institutional priority for several years has been to raise academic standards. Guidelines for administrators, faculty, and students are given on the provost’s Web page. Efforts have been made by faculty and administrators, such as controlling grade inflation. However, few changes have been made on the student side of the equation. Academic standards might be raised by implementing more strict criteria for admissions and for continuing as a student. While recent attempts to modify policies that would tighten standards were only partially successful, this issue could be revisited.

Discussion Point:

Should CMU more aggressively pursue strategies to raise academic standards?

2.5.3 Reducing time committed to student interaction

CMU has long enjoyed a reputation for being a student-focused, friendly university — a place where faculty provide personal attention and are responsive to undergraduates. Few classes are taught by graduate students. Professors commonly schedule four to five open office hours a week and routinely respond to student e-mail and phone calls. In

---

15 www.provost.cmich.edu/viceprovost/VP/StandardsPPT.ppt
16 Example 1: CMU policy allows a student to add a class up to a week after it begins, which often requires make-up sessions by the instructor, and to withdraw from a course up to the end of the tenth week of the semester, which leads to some students not taking class work seriously and to rather high repeat rates.
Example 2: The due process and fairness aspects of the academic integrity policy — documenting the violation, notification and meeting with student(s), consulting on and deciding on sanctions, and interacting with the Dean of Students Office — is very time-consuming, causing some faculty to ignore problems.
general, the administration and departments expect this tradition of faculty availability to students to continue.

Many faculty members feel that CMU students expect a high level of availability and responsiveness that is uncommon at major research universities. On the other hand, the NSSE data indicate that students perceive student-faculty interactions at CMU to be similar to or less than the average at Doctoral/Research-Intensive (DRI) universities (see Table 8-2). Whatever the truth, it is likely that any dramatic reduction in availability and responsiveness would be met with considerable complaint and dissatisfaction from both students (and parents) as well as many in the CMU community.

Discussion Point:

How can CMU maintain a student-friendly environment within the context of its proposed transition to more emphasis on scholarship?

2.5.4 Decreasing expectations for administrative and service work

Finally, we mention that more time for research might be gained by reducing the administrative and service work of faculty members. Many feel that time devoted to these areas is growing.

Faculty are increasingly asked to participate in such activities as student recruitment, fund raising and alumni relations, and news interviews and public relations. They serve on almost all of the multitude of committees of the departments, colleges, university, and Academic Senate; many of these concern academic and curricular issues, but a sizeable number are not directly related. Budget-induced reductions in support staff along with improved administrative efficiency through “self-service” have increased the time that a faculty member must spend on paperwork — seeking and completing forms on-line rather than having it handled by a secretary.

One issue that could be addressed is improving the efficiency of administrative tasks. For example, when a proposal to change a requirement for a teacher education program is made, approximately 170 faculty and staff review the proposal as it moves through the curricular process. Is that an appropriate use of the time for all 170 people? Do we need to keep doing things like we have done in the past when these processes were developed for a much smaller institution?

Regardless of the source, increased expectations for faculty time devoted to committee work and administrative matters detract from time that could be spent on teaching or research. Only in a few cases of exceptional administrative or committee responsibilities are adjustments made in course load.

Discussion Point:

What can CMU do to minimize service and administrative demands placed on faculty?

What changes can be made in procedures that will free up more time for scholarly activity?
2.6 SECTION SUMMARY

CMU’s traditional focus on quality undergraduate education and a student-friendly environment is in contrast to the research-focus model in place at flagship research universities. Significant time is required of individual faculty members to maintain quality undergraduate teaching and to maintain the high levels of availability to students that seem to be taken for granted among much of our undergraduate population. This is due to, among other factors, our teaching loads, high student/faculty ratios, and the institutional desire to raise academic standards. Other demands placed on faculty time are the growing involvement of undergraduates in faculty (and original) research and in service and administrative tasks.

If CMU is to increase research and creative activities, then ways must be found for the faculty to have more time to devote to these. There will be necessary trade-offs in terms of quality teaching and availability to students versus research productivity, if no reduction in teaching obligations accompanies the increased emphasis on research.

Discussion Point:

What are the best ways to provide more time for faculty to engage in research without jeopardizing quality teaching and faculty availability?

QUESTION 3

How do we ensure support for our small set of doctoral programs and assure that these represent appropriate areas of focus for CMU given its faculty, resource base and markets for potential students?

CMU currently has ten doctoral programs. These are listed in Table 8-3, which also gives the number of students and typical teaching loads for those involved with the program. The difference between the number of students reported by the Office of Institutional Research and by the departments illustrates CMU’s problem with lack of easily-assessable centralized record keeping.
CMU’s doctoral programs were established in two distinct ways as the university decided to move into doctoral education. First, several programs originated in departments that had the desire and a willingness to initiate a doctoral program, even with the knowledge that adequate infrastructure for doctoral education was lacking. These programs typically built on existing masters programs with the doctorate focusing on a special area. CMU’s first doctoral program was the Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.), an applied program that was an extension of the existing masters programs in Clinical and School Psychology. The Ph.D. programs in History and Mathematics are others in this category. The creation of these programs required significant shifts of resources, both financial and human, within the respective departments. These changes at times created divisiveness. For example, faculty directly involved in the doctoral training felt they now had increased responsibilities (e.g., dissertation supervision) while those not involved felt they now had an unfair share of the teaching burden as they were assigned larger sections of undergraduate classes that were needed to support the doctoral program.
The second way by which doctoral programs originated was largely in response to market demand. Examples are the Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.), Doctor of Health Administration (DHA), and the new Doctorates in Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) and Educational Leadership (Ed.D.). These programs are targeted to specialized populations and, in most cases, are expected to be largely self-supporting. They often have a significant off-campus component. Problems can arise when the expected income does not meet projections.

3.1 SUPPORTING DOCTORAL EDUCATION AT CMU

The emergence of doctoral programs at CMU has provided important lessons in terms of what is needed for a program to thrive. Providing adequate support for even our current small set of doctoral programs has proven to be somewhat problematic. A recent short moratorium on admissions to the new Doctor of Health Administration (DHA) program due to financial concerns attests to the difficulty that some programs are facing. While there is considerable variability in the design, goals, and operation of the existing set of doctoral programs at CMU, there are several common challenges that all programs face in terms of support and infrastructure. The more prominent issues concern faculty course loads, staffing doctoral programs, student recruitment, adequate operating budgets and space, and securing support for the program.

3.1.1 Teaching loads

The first critical need is for faculty to have sufficient time to supervise doctoral students in the various aspects of their training. The additional time burdens include supervising research, dissertations, practicums, internships, and clinical work as well as such tasks as preparing and evaluating qualifying examinations and coordinating candidates’ committees and paperwork.

The CMU contract specifies that “the instructional portion of a faculty member’s full-time work load consists of nine (9) to twelve (12) credit hours per semester as determined by the department” and “Adjustments to his/her workload may be made for various academic purposes, such as . . . supervision of theses or dissertations. . .” What constitutes a credit hour (is thesis credit included?) and the criteria for an adjusted workload are largely left to the department. There is consequently wide variation among the doctoral-granting departments.

As shown in Table 8-3, most departments with doctoral programs have reduced teaching loads for those faculty involved with doctoral students from CMU’s contractual standard of three to four courses a semester. The relatively heavy teaching loads make operating a quality doctoral program difficult, impacting such factors as the ability to conduct research and publish, to apply for external funding, and to attract the better-qualified students.

Perhaps surprising is that some efforts to reduce teaching loads have met with resistance. One reason is the worry by departments and deans about the effect on SCH, particularly in light of tight budgets and an
RCM budget model that rewards SCH production. However, even some suggestions that would maintain or increase the SCH production per FTE have been opposed. A major stumbling block appears to be finding a formula acceptable to all departments, and hence which could be incorporated into the collective bargaining agreement. This penchant for equity may be laudable, but it complicates making adequate faculty time available for doctoral education. Devising an acceptable common workload formula may not be possible when many departments do not have, nor do they aspire to ever have, a doctoral program, and even among the departments that do have them, there is considerable disparity in student needs and nature of the curricula.17

3.1.2 Staffing doctoral programs

A second important issue is having a faculty adequate for maintaining a successful doctoral program. Not only must there be sufficient numbers (a “critical mass”), but specialized expertise and higher levels of scholarship are needed. It is seldom the case that all faculty members in a department are prepared to provide the proper training to doctoral students nor that a department will have all the necessary expertise when a program is initiated.

Hiring necessary new faculty can cause divisive issues for an emerging program in an institution with a historical emphasis on undergraduate education. In a comprehensive, undergraduate-focused institution, the most common criterion for advocating faculty lines is simply to point out the courses that need to be covered. New hiring criteria stemming from the unique demands of doctoral programs can seem quite strange to many.

Instead of teaching potential being the primary criterion in the hiring process, research expertise now becomes equally important. This can lead to consternation on the part of those who will not relinquish the primacy of undergraduate teaching as the basic mission of the department, and often conjures resistance. When a decision to hire a faculty member who provides needed expertise in an area of research critical to the training of doctoral students supercedes that of another candidate with a weaker research record, but substantially more teaching experience, a considerable degree of dissonance within the department may ensue. The changes in the way faculty are hired can lead to significant re-configurations within a department or within a college. Some courses or programs may need to be altered, and some traditional areas may be reduced or even eliminated to provide adequate support for the doctoral programs.

17 Even within the Psychology Department, which has four programs, there is considerable variation. Faculty in the Clinical Program must spend more time in clinical supervision of their students, while faculty in the Applied Experimental Program must spend more time supervising their students’ additional research. Not surprisingly, there is little agreement as to which program requires more time and resources.
In order to attract, recruit, and retain top-notch faculty with high-level research programs to an institution like CMU, it is often necessary to offer higher than normal salaries and startup funds. This is particularly true if one wants to hire someone with national stature. The higher salary and greater startup costs these people demand can often be offset by the increased grant support they attract. Nonetheless, such hires have considerable impact on salary compression and other issues of equity both within and between departments. During times of salary compression and shrinking resources, this can engender some envy and frustration on the part of some faculty members and hinder the acceptance of new colleagues.

A final consideration is what happens if a doctoral program must be phased out. Long timers can probably revert to their roles prior to the initiation of the program. On the other hand, dealing with faculty hired specifically for a program that does not have an undergraduate base (for example, CMU’s D.H.A. program) would be complicated, particularly given our collective bargaining environment.

Given the above issues, successfully incorporating new doctoral faculty into a department and college during a transition into a more research-oriented university can be daunting, but it is critically important to the success of a doctoral program.

**Discussion Points:**

- How can the different demands placed on faculty in doctoral programs be compared equitably with those of faculty in non-doctoral programs?
- When deciding whether or not to start a new doctoral program, should CMU have some contingency plan for faculty in the event that the program needs to be terminated?

### 3.1.3 Student recruitment

The reputation and viability of a doctoral program hinges significantly on the quality of students it can attract. High caliber students not only contribute to the program’s visibility through their research efforts, they also set higher academic standards, which usually drives increased standards at all levels. This is one of the major rationales for having doctoral programs.

In most programs it is difficult for CMU to attract and retain outstanding doctoral students. We do not yet have the reputation of most competitors and our incentives are less. The incentives in market-focused programs involve such student-oriented factors as attractive course scheduling and compressed time to degree. These can be addressed, but one must be careful not to diminish academic rigor.

In the traditional programs, the primary incentive is the level of financial support provided, which is usually in the form of an assistantship. Our assistant stipends are considerably lower than other programs, even those at doctoral-intensive institutions, with which we compete for students, and our programs generally have fewer assistantships to offer. The assistantships available generally require teaching rather than research responsibilities.
The best solution would be to increase the number of assistantships. Another possibility would be to increase the stipend levels but reduce the number available. However, the fact that a viable program needs a critical mass of students along with pressures from the university and the state for classes and programs to have “sufficient” enrollments make this strategy less attractive. There are increased efforts by programs to garner external funding to help support doctoral students, but these have had mixed success.

Another issue with assistantships involves the responsibilities they carry. Most graduate students assist in teaching or even teach courses themselves, but this has been questioned by those (including some administrators) who feel regular courses should only be taught by faculty. On the other hand, some feel it is unfair when doctoral students can function as research assistants when most graduate students have teaching commitments.

Discussion Point:

Should CMU increase its graduate assistantship stipends, even if it leads to a reduction in the number of graduate degrees conferred?

3.1.4 Operating budgets

Doctoral programs are significantly more expensive than undergraduate or even masters-level programs. The additional expenses can partially be offset by increased successful grant writing or by higher tuition rates for doctoral programs.

Traditionally, annual department funding at CMU has been largely determined by precedence. Although the transformation from an SCH-driven model to a responsibility-centered model (RCM) has provided considerable freedom for deans to adjust operating budgets, many are still based on cost-per-student ratios generated decades ago. Also, the evolving rules of the new RCM model has hampered long-range planning, particularly budgeting for start-up costs for new doctoral program hires. While RCM has the promise of carrying forward funds, the new rules are leading to a return to the pressure to fully spend one’s annual allocation. We see a need to reexamine the base budgets of units in view of doctoral programs and to establish clear rules for RCM that permit planning.

Discussion Point:

How can CMU improve its present methods of allocating S&E budgets for doctoral programs?

3.1.5 Space

An issue that can easily be overlooked is the space needs of a doctoral program. At the very minimum, on-campus doctoral students need
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18 The stipends available to the Clinical, I/O, and School Psychology programs are split in half in order to have a critical mass of students and adequate enrollments in these programs.
office space, especially since many will be doing some teaching. Specialized space is necessary for some types of programs, such as research laboratories or places to meet with clients in a clinical program. Creating or expanding a program without considering the space needs can lead to conditions that limit productivity and negatively impact faculty and student recruitment. Examples are attempting to accommodate demand by using under-utilized space — areas distant from the department, in basements or lacking air conditioning.

Discussion Point:
Does CMU need to increase the amount and quality of lab and office space for existing doctoral faculty and students?

3.1.6 Support for the program
Support for a doctoral program within the department and the college is also important. Some may resist attempts to initiate doctoral programs and not support them once created. Getting the faculty to support doctoral programs, not only within a department but also within a college, is not an easy task. Nevertheless, broad support is crucial and it is critical that the value of having the doctoral program is clearly articulated so that resistance is mitigated.

In addition to gaining faculty support, it is important that the dean and other administrators are supportive of doctoral programs and sensitive to the special needs that these programs require. It may be difficult for deans who have functioned primarily as administrators of non-doctorate, less research-oriented departments to make the necessary adjustments to adequately support the needs of new and ongoing doctoral programs. Sensitivity to the extra effort it takes to mentor doctoral students, both in terms of time and other resources is critical for a program. This is particularly difficult when only one or a few of a college’s departments require this extra support, because deans want to avoid accusations of favoritism, even if they realize that the additional resources for the doctoral programs is an equitable and justifiable compensation for the extra efforts that are demanded of doctoral faculty.

There likely will be the need to hire additional faculty. Providing a quality doctoral program often requires a very low student-to-faculty ratio with class sizes for these students much smaller than either undergraduate or masters-level courses. Deans who recognize a need for additional faculty for a doctoral department can feel pressure from the non-doctoral departments that feel unfairly treated given their relatively higher SCH/FTE ratios. In addition, because most doctoral students receive stipends (assistantships), the financial return from a doctoral student is very low.

Discussion Points:
How can CMU best provide adequate support for existing doctoral programs?

What can be done to overcome perceived inequities and animosity that some faculty members in non-doctoral departments may harbor for those working in the doctoral programs?
3.2 DETERMINING APPROPRIATE AREAS OF FOCUS

CMU’s mission statement includes the words that it will offer “selected high quality graduate programs” and “graduate programs in niche areas of faculty strength that meet regional, state, national and international needs.” Thus, it is a given that CMU will not develop a comprehensive set of doctoral programs, but will focus on a few programs that can be competitive. It is important for CMU to devise strategies to ensure that our doctoral programs represent appropriate areas of focus given its faculty and resource base and the markets for potential students.

The present set of programs developed in essentially two ways: a decision to move into doctoral education, usually building on a strong master-level program, and in response to market demand for the program. There was often little overlap of these two factors – some programs were created with little consideration of market factors while others were created for market reasons without an existing adequate faculty and resource base. The curricular process requires some justification for starting a new doctoral program, based on need within the state and assurance that the efforts of the new program do not duplicate existing programs, but these are not easy to forecast and proposals are generally given the benefit of doubt. Proposed programs are reviewed at the state level, but the recommendation is not binding.

We see several areas that should be considered as new doctoral programs are proposed and existing ones reviewed. The most important seem to be market factors and the resources available to support a program.

3.2.1 The market for doctoral students

CMU already faces stiff competition for outstanding doctoral students. Competitive stipends are critical for successfully attracting sufficient students and the quality of students that will propel a program into national prominence. It may prove critical for a program’s survival to be able to adapt to changes in the market. For example, CMU’s Au.D. program is targeted at practitioners in the field who desire to earn a doctorate while continuing their practice. The number of potential students may be satisfactory at present, but as more practitioners gain their degrees there may well be fewer students interested in the program and one must ask if the program can make adaptations that will allow it to continue.

3.2.2 The market for graduates

Influencing the ability to attract students is the market for the program’s graduates. As demographics, economics and interests within the state and nation change, opportunities for a program’s graduates may be affected, and the program may become outmoded or less desired with such market shifts. In the case of doctoral programs with a significant off-campus component, the specialized niche a program once occupied can soon be filled with unforeseen competitors through the proliferation of web-based programs as well as new initiatives at other institutions.
3.2.3 Market effects on program operation

A factor that affects some programs, including many of our present ones, is the need to find practicum and internship sites for their students. This is not always an easy task, and is sensitive to changes in the market. We should be cautious about having programs with a fundamental part dependent on factors entirely beyond our control.

In summary, it is important that CMU take a long-term view of the market opportunities and constraints affecting existing programs as well as potentially new ones. The market analysis should be an important element in the difficult decisions regarding the extent to which a given program receives support from the university.

Discussion Points:

How can CMU accurately predict the market demand for doctoral programs in niche areas?

How can CMU best predict the market opportunities for doctoral students?

3.3 Resource Base

Perhaps the most pressing issue affecting both the support for graduate programs and determining appropriate areas of focus, as CMU attempts to transition into a more research-oriented, nationally-prominent institution, is its resource base. CMU is significantly under-funded in relation to most universities involved in doctoral education. Furthermore, we have a long tradition of treating programs as equally — in good economic times budgets were increased relatively equally and during bad economic times the cuts were usually done across-the-board.

It has become increasingly clear that the funds available for academic programs are not sufficient even to support our present doctoral programs at levels that would allow all of them to successfully compete for national prominence. It is also clear that not all departments that desire to have a doctoral program will be able to have one. It follows that the university will need to make critical decisions as to what programs to start, what programs to keep, and what programs should be expanded if CMU wishes to maintain the Carnegie doctoral-intensive status.

Making such decisions means that a model using across-the-board cuts and increases has to be avoided, although this can be difficult politically. The phasing out, or placing a moratorium on accepting students into, any program, as was recently done with the DHA and undergraduate Museum Studies programs, is met with almost insurmountable resistance. Nevertheless, such difficult decisions may be necessary if the university is serious about providing adequate support for doctoral programs.

Moreover, in its penchant to achieve national prominence, difficult choices will have to be made as to which programs (both doctoral and non-doctoral, both academic and non-academic) will receive increased support and which will not, based on potential to compete nationally. As one example, does CMU have an adequate resource base to operate
doctoral programs at a level that would attain national stature and, at the same time, maintain quality undergraduate education and provide the subsidies needed to operate a Division IA intercollegiate athletics program?

Discussion Points:

How should CMU choose which programs provide the best opportunity to achieve national prominence?

What are the best ways to assure adequate support for our doctoral programs?

How can CMU best determine which programs are worthy of additional support, if funds were available, or which to eliminate if required by budget difficulties?

3.4 SECTION SUMMARY

We have mentioned a number of the several hurdles to deal with in an effort to find ways to ensure support for our existing doctoral programs and assure that they represent appropriate areas of focus, given our faculty, resource base, and markets for potential students. Solutions for many of these problems will not be easy, and will take a considerable amount of fortitude on the part of the university’s decision makers. Our review led us to the following findings.

The university must avoid across-the-board allocation policies. CMU has announced that it has embraced this notion, but it has been difficult to implement it in any meaningful way. In addition, a rational budgetary process must be implemented that will allow programs, departments, and colleges a reasonable way to estimate their yearly allocations relatively accurately. This includes implementing guiding principles for how carry-forward funds will be handled. In order for any of our doctoral programs to achieve national prominence, they will have to be given adequate support to make them competitive with doctoral programs at other universities — support in terms of teaching loads, doctoral student stipends, adequate space, and supplies and equipment. Foremost among these would be a reduced teaching load, because this would allow the faculty members more time to conduct research and to write grants that could help overcome our shortcomings. However, if this transition is to be accomplished without sacrificing the quality of our undergraduate programs, it will take more than competitive teaching loads to propel any of our doctoral programs into the nationally prominent status. Either state appropriations or tuition increases, or both, will be necessary to achieve the level of funding needed to compete with nationally prominent doctoral programs. In the absence of this, the University may need to make critical decisions about its priorities. For example, having a Division IA athletic program and having doctoral-intensive status, with any semblance of national prominence, may be mutually exclusive goals given our present revenue levels.
QUESTION 4
This question was considered together with question 2

QUESTION 5
Are infrastructure changes needed to accomplish the transition to increased scholarship and national prominence? If so, what are they and how are they best accomplished?

This guiding question addresses what infrastructure is required to promote faculty research. For the purpose of the present discussion, “research” is used to discuss scholarship in its broadest interpretation. Following Boyer (1990), this includes:

- scholarship of discovery: original research that creates new knowledge;
- scholarship of integration: work with a variety of disciplines to draw together information;
- scholarship of application: use of knowledge within a field; and
- scholarship of teaching: investigation of the processes of teaching and learning.

We also include what at CMU is referred to as “creative activity” — the professional endeavors by those in the arts, such as creation of artworks and musical and theatrical performance.

The tripartite functions of faculty work consist of teaching, research, and service. Organizational structure, institutional culture and reward structures shape how faculty members’ work is divided among the three areas. When discussing ways to increase research, it is important to consider not only what facilitates this aspect but also those functions that may take time away from it. These have been detailed in previous sections of this chapter (in particular, Section 3) and will not be repeated here. We will focus on the infrastructure that aids and enables research to occur.

We first review the structures currently in place at CMU to promote scholarship. Next, we examine research on faculty work to determine if there are particular structures that best promote the potential for faculty to enhance their scholarship. Finally, we compare CMU’s current structures with those that promote research — broadly defined — to determine what changes might be required at CMU to better support a transition to increased scholarship and how best to accomplish them.

5.1 RESEARCH EXPECTATIONS AND DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS

The criteria for career advancement — specifically those for promotion and tenure decisions — strongly influence the amount of time a faculty member will dedicate to research. The CMU faculty contract stipulates that the criteria and standards used to evaluate faculty for personnel decisions are determined by the individual departments and formalized
in departmental bylaws. As such, a great deal of variability exists between and within colleges on the expectation for research. Some departments outline specific requirements, such as a specified number of publications or a level needed on a point system for various research activities, while others leave the determination of what constitutes a satisfactory research record to the reviewers’ judgment.

**Discussion Points:**

- Should departmental bylaws be reviewed by departments to ensure a common understanding of research expectations and measures of what is appropriate for the field?
- Should the faculty contract be modified to ensure more equity across units?

### 5.2 Existent Support for Research Activities

There are a number of ways by which CMU currently promotes research on campus. The support system has grown significantly in the last ten years, but is still modest compared to many doctoral/research-intensive universities. It nevertheless has benefited a number of research programs.

Most support activities are managed by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP). This office, under the direction of the graduate dean and vice provost for research, operates several internal funding programs, including one for student research. Externally-funded research is supported by assistance in grant writing, in preparing proposal budgets, and in the management and reporting requirements. New hires are made aware of the resources available to them for research and meet staff from the ORSP office during orientation.

One can ask if ORSP has the capacity to handle increased research and grant writing activity. The office currently has a budget of approximately $440,000 and a staff that includes 2.8 research officers and two clerical employees. Efforts are currently underway to determine if this level of staffing is sufficient given the growth in grant submissions and the associated tasks over the past few years.

#### 5.2.1 Internal Funding Opportunities

Funding to support research is important in encouraging researchers and a research culture. Typical uses are to carry out a small research project, to cover start-up or exploratory costs for a new project, to cover small miscellaneous project expenses, or to support the preparation of a grant application. CMU funding opportunities for research include:

- **President’s Research Investment Fund (PRIF):** grants up to $25,000 for two years to support research, with the objective to encourage efforts to make research programs competitive for external funding and with the understanding that a recipient will submit a major proposal to an external funding agency.
Faculty Research and Creative Endeavors program: provides small research grants (direct project costs up to $7,500, presentation and publication costs up to $1,000 per year), and page charges and reprints.

Research Excellence Funds (REF): funds used to support basic applied research and center/institute development projects.

Grant Development Reimbursement Award: grants that cover a variety of expenses related to developing a proposal for external funding.

Faculty Insight Team (FIT) grants: up to $5,000 funding per year for up to three years for research projects carried out by teams composed of both faculty and students.

The amounts awarded through these programs in the 2003-04 year are shown in Table 8-4. As discussed in Chapter 6, Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge, these programs have been successful in stimulating research and grant writing.

It is also important that funds be available to report the results of scholarship at disciplinary conferences. A conference presentation allows the presenter to have the research reviewed and critiqued by experts in the field and the presentation often provides the basis for a journal article. Also, exposure at conferences is critical as CMU seeks national prominence. Conference presentations are supported through:

- ORSP Premier Display Grants: grants of $300 to $1,000 based on the distance required to travel.

- Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching (FaCIT) grants: up to $1,000 or 75% of university reimbursable expenses for faculty attendance at conferences.

Despite having these programs, limits on awards often prevent covering the complete cost of a conference trip and limit funding to one conference trip a year, leaving faculty to partially self-fund these activities. The limited budgets for these programs presently confines the extent to which faculty are able to present their research.

Discussion Points:

- Are the currently available internal funds and support for external funding sufficient to allow CMU to secure national prominence with respect to faculty scholarship?

- How does CMU compare to similar institutions in internal grant availability?

- How do we ensure that internal grants are equitably distributed across all CMU colleges?

- Do internal grants dissuade faculty from pursuing external funding?

5.2.2 Recognition and incentives for research

Perhaps equally important with funding research is encouraging research and a culture of research by recognition and incentives. CMU has the following awards:
• **Research Incentive Award (RIA):** award given to any faculty member receiving an external grant with a total value in excess of $50,000/year and that includes a month or more of summer support for the faculty member, returns indirect costs, and directly involves students in the project.

• **President’s Award for Outstanding Research & Creative Endeavors:** annual award to two senior faculty members consisting of a development grant and name engraved on a permanent plaque.

• **Provost’s Award for Outstanding Research & Creative Endeavors:** annual award to two faculty members in the early years of their careers consisting of a development grant and name engraved on a permanent plaque.

A former policy allocated one quarter of the overhead from a grant to the principal investigator along with one quarter each to ORSP, the college, and the department. This incentive for researchers has been discontinued with the distribution now 55% to ORSP and 45% to the college.

**Discussion Point:**

Is the policy on distribution of indirect revenues from grants and contracts optimal in terms of promoting research?

5.2.3 Support for regulated research

CMU has several groups that ensure that research in regulated areas complies with policy. These include the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for research involving human subjects, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for research involving animals, and several safety committees for research with hazardous materials. CMU’s lack of extensive experience with research has led to occasional conflicts between these bodies and researchers, including a case of delayed permission for a project by a Fulbright scholar.

**Discussion Point:**

How can CMU ensure timely IRB and IACUC review processes?

5.2.4 Cooperative research opportunities

Finally, there are two organizations affiliated with CMU that provide research opportunities for faculty in selected areas. These are:

• **CMU Research Corporation:** This not-for-profit company, wholly owned by CMU, was created to facilitate cooperative research with industry. CMURC has attracted some prominent business partners who contract with faculty and students in such areas as proof of concept business projects, data-mining investigations, and nanoscale materials research (primarily dendrimers).

• **Center for Applied Research and Technology:** CMU has partnered with the Mid Michigan Development Corporation and the state of Michigan to establish one of Michigan’s “Smart
Zones,” which houses startup companies with promising futures for Michigan’s economy. The companies provide research opportunities in the sciences and business.

Discussion Points:

Is the support structure for research appropriate at all levels: the department, the college and the university?

How does support for research at CMU compare with other universities with similar missions?

5.3 STRUCTURES THAT ENCOURAGE SCHOLARSHIP

An important part of the strategy for increasing scholarship involves the structuring of promotion and tenure policies, which at CMU largely means through departmental bylaws. These probably exert the strongest influence on the time a faculty member devotes to research. To increase scholarly activity, it follows that these should be developed to foster a culture where research is expected and valued.

When developing policies and support structures, however, it must be remembered that the needs and motivators for different groups of faculty, such as those in different stages in their careers, differ. We will consider four groups:

- **New faculty**: those fairly recent hires who are working toward tenure (which at CMU means within six years of hire).
- **Mid-career faculty**: those who have achieved tenure but are decades from retirement.
- **Late-career faculty**: those who are within ten years of retirement.
- **Faculty with special requirements**.

The challenge is to avoid a single motivational strategy that does not permit a targeted approach toward motivating the different groups.

5.3.1 New faculty

New faculty are an important group as CMU seeks to enhance research. First, members of this group are working toward tenure and, as such, act according to what is rewarded in the tenure process. Second, as recent hires, they do not have a vested interest in the existing culture and are more amenable to changes and demands for measuring productivity in new ways en route to tenure. Finally, there will be significant numbers of new faculty as the bulk of those hired during the expansionary years of the 1960s and 1970s takes retirement.

At CMU, new faculty members (those hired since 2000, many of whom are pre-tenured) comprise 33% of the faculty ranks. Those hired since the Carnegie reclassification of CMU have had research expectations specifically addressed in their letters of hire. Faculty in a few areas also have expectations for securing external funding in their appointment letters.

Given the time and expense involved in recruitment and training of new faculty, it is imperative to provide an environment in which they
feel supported. Early efforts include describing available services during orientation and FaCIT’s “new learning community” sessions that help new faculty navigate their first year on campus.

At the time of hire, a new faculty member individually negotiates with the dean the terms of hire. Negotiable items include a reduced teaching load for the initial year, research start-up funds (e.g. lab equipment or computer and software packages), and graduate assistant support as well as initial salary. Since this negotiation is driven by the individual, it can result in disparity between new faculty members hired in the same department or between departments. This can cause unhappiness and even resignations, especially for women who traditionally fare less well than male faculty in negotiating. Salary disparities are particularly divisive for the inequity will continue for the entire CMU career given that starting salary is the basis for subsequent salary increases.

Pre-tenure faculty act largely according to what is rewarded in the tenure process. Research on new faculty indicates that when the criteria and standards for tenure are not clearly stated it causes a great deal of stress for a candidate.\textsuperscript{20} It can also lead to cases where a positive tenure decision is in jeopardy and there is little time left to rectify direction. At CMU, some department bylaws are quite explicit in outlining the expectations, but others provide little guidance. These departments should be encouraged to make changes, but it may require a concerted effort by interested department faculty and college deans to suggest and implement changes, given the process and inertia.

Discussion Points:

Should there be a common package of support offered to all new hires that complements individually negotiated items? Issues to consider are reduced teaching loads for the first year; start up funds—either professional development funds or research funds; graduate student research support; clerical support.

Should there be “at large” graduate assistants for departments with no graduate programs?

5.3.2 Mid-career faculty

This area of faculty life has seen little scholarly study, and it will be easier to address the particular concerns of this group as the characteristics of this career stage become better understood. In the meantime, it is clear that mid-career faculty face different challenges compared to their junior colleagues. As faculty move along their career path post-tenure, additional departmental and university-wide responsibilities are acquired. Mid-career faculty members often begin to move into leadership positions in the institution and in professional organizations. As established faculty, they often have heavier student advisement, both undergraduates and perhaps graduate project supervision. External pressures may increase due to family and other factors as they become integrated into their communities.

\textsuperscript{20} Tierney & Bensimon, 1996
One indication of the number of mid-career faculty at CMU is the percentage of those at associate professor rank. This is currently 27% — a number which has remained fairly stable since 2000. This group has witnessed the evolution from a predominately teaching culture to one with some emphasis on research. Depending on how much they have focused on research while at CMU, the transition may present more or less challenges.

This group of faculty is post-tenure and motivators other than tenure must be employed if mid-career faculty are to partake in more scholarship. A prime motivator is the opportunity for promotion. One of the best features of CMU’s promotion and tenure system is the professor supplement, which allows those who achieve professor rank to continue to be “promoted” every four years. As with tenure, the criteria and standards for promotion are determined by department bylaws, which vary significantly from very prescriptive to vague. Article 6 of the contract requires there be an opportunity for the dean and department chair to provide feedback every five years after their last successful promotion.

Given the rapid changes in some fields, some later-career faculty would find it difficult to re-initiate independent research programs if they have not been recently active. Is it practical or fair to require these faculty to do so in order to share in the reward system? If not, this raises the question of what should then be their roles and reward possibilities.

Discussion Point:

What types of motivators are necessary to have mid-career faculty maintain or increase their activity in research and scholarship?

5.3.3 Late-career faculty

The individuals comprising this group generally have served as long-term employees of the university, but may be more recent hires setting out on a second career later in life. The professional schools are more likely homes to these second-career faculty since experience in the field is a valuable commodity. The traditional late-career faculty members often take on leadership roles. These may be in the institution or may be for a particular area or even a course specialty in the department. They often have some interest in preparing for their successors.

Some research indicates that research productivity on average drops off with age, although many senior faculty members remain highly productive. Thus, one can expect some late-career faculty to be little focused on research while others may have become more focused now that other pressures have diminished and they have developed reputations in their specializations.

Currently 20% of CMU faculty members are age 60 or older. This represents a six percentage point increase since 2000. Since there is no

---

21 Bland & Bergquist, 1997
mandatory retirement age, this percentage may increase over the next several years if individuals decide to delay retirement.

In some respects the concerns and motivators of faculty members in this career stage parallel those of mid-career faculty. There are some differences, however. For example, it may be that receiving funds for research are not as valued as the recognition of their efforts. To maintain overall research productivity for this group, it is critical to support the motivators for those that are research active. These may include formal recognition, seeking their advice in a participative governance structure, fair salaries and rewards for significant accomplishments, and providing opportunities for growth. Some senior faculty members may be motivated by serving as mentors to newer faculty, enhancing the research levels for both groups. Others may be content to serve in support roles for those more in step with modern research. A comprehensive plan to increase scholarship should consider how to ensure that the graying faculty remain energized in their last years of service.

Discussion Points:

- What are motivators for late-career faculty to maintain interest in scholarship and in mentoring the scholarship of junior faculty?
- How might the expertise of late-career faculty be tapped to best benefit the university?

5.3.4 Faculty with special requirements

Encouraging scholarship by some faculty members may require addressing special needs. An obvious example would be providing special support services for a faculty member with a physical handicap, such as blindness. Two much more common cases are the needs of female faculty and faculty members of color.

Women faculty face additional pressures compared to their male colleagues. Women generally have primary responsibility for child rearing, elder care, and household management in families. They usually are pursuing tenure in the prime of their childbearing years. A recent study\(^{22}\) found that women faculty members were more often single compared to their male contemporaries and had fewer or no children. Thus, a faculty career path comes at a real personal cost for women.

Women faculty presently comprise 47% of assistant professors, 37% of associate professors, and 25% of full professorships at CMU, which mirrors national trends.\(^{23}\) A motivator for female faculty is the “friendliness” of tenure and promotion policies toward family issues. For those seeking to start families, is there a policy in place that can stop the tenure clock for a period? The Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) allows up to 12 work weeks per calendar year for certain family and medical reasons, but is there a subtle expectation that the leaves, such as for childbirth, be timed to coincide with the academic calendar? In the cases

22 Mason & Goulden, 2004
23 NCES, 2002
of taking time to care for a sick child, is the resultant slower research progress seen negatively?

Given that departmental bylaws govern tenure and promotion decisions at CMU, cases are handled on an ad hoc basis. This can place pressure on a female faculty member to avoid appearances of not being as committed to their work as their male counterparts. It would be interesting to see if there are women faculty opting to leave CMU because of present policies.

Faculty of color also face additional pressures in their careers, particularly those employed at primarily white institutions (PWI). They may experience marginalization and difficulties “fitting-in.” They often face “cultural taxation”: they are obligated to fill multiple committee roles in order for the university to have a diverse representation for these groups, to serve as mentors to students of color, and often are tapped to fill community roles. This creates a time burden not experienced by their white colleagues. Faculty of color often feel pressured to focus on research topics acceptable to their white colleagues; publishing in journals geared towards issues of color (e.g., *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* or *Black Higher Education*) are often deemed less prestigious than mainstream journals and earn less credit during tenure decisions. Many of these comments about stress from cultural differences also apply to faculty from other countries, a population that is growing at U.S. universities and at CMU.

In 2003, only 15% of the professors at CMU were faculty of color. As with gender, this percentage mirrors national norms (NCES, 2002). CMU has an institutional interest in retaining such faculty. This is fostered by having a welcoming and supportive environment and, in many fields, the recognition of ethnicity-related research as legitimate scholarship. Specific actions can include identifying the journals the department feels are valuable for publications, but also opening up for consideration journals that may be less well known by white colleagues.

Discussion Points:

What policies can be implemented to aid women faculty in being successful in their careers?

Should policies be implemented to make the tenure process, especially for women, create less conflict between family versus work choices?

What can CMU do to help create a supportive culture for faculty of color?

Should consideration be given to new policies on how to recruit and retain faculty of color?

---

24 One new faculty member interviewed as part of a research study noted, “I had my baby in October, right in the middle of the semester and still taught. . . . I didn’t want anyone to think that I wasn’t serious about my work, especially because the people who were making decisions about the tenure-track position were these very old white men.” (personal interview, Eddy, November, 2003).

25 Johnsrud, 1993


27 Frierson, 1990
5.4 BEST PRACTICES TO ENHANCE FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP

Research documents the changes taking place in higher education. Teaching now may involve students who differ widely in their levels of ability, more diverse classes, new technologies and pedagogies, and interdisciplinary approaches. Faculties have larger percentages of female, international, and minority members. Faculty roles are expanding to include more responsibilities and expectations to be productive in multiple arenas. In many fields there is growing recognition and acceptance of new types of research.\textsuperscript{28}

Policies designed to support research must have the flexibility to address a variety of faculty and departmental needs. For faculty, some of these needs will be common to all while some will depend on such variables as career stage, gender, and race. One specific recommendation for faculty of color is to avoid overloading them with committee work.\textsuperscript{29} For departments, all need mechanisms to support scholarship, but research in some disciplines have higher costs. In some cases adequate support may only be possible through external funding.

A less obvious requirement on the road to national prominence is the creation of a research culture. Since many of CMU’s current faculty have roots in a culture that valued teaching over research, a shift whereby research gains in prominence is required to aid CMU’s transition. Culture is defined by artifacts and attention to what is valued within an organization. Public acclamation of the visible artifacts of faculty research serves as one mechanism for shifting culture, which speaks to the importance of such things as our president and provost awards. More important, however, is probably the cultures within departments. It is within these smaller organizational units that new faculty are socialized to what matters. Research colloquiums with low attendance, lack of discussion of faculty research, little departmental collaboration in research, and lack of funding for travel for professional presentations all send messages that counter a movement to a research culture.

The reward structure is closely tied to culture and serves to highlight what the institution values. Faculty will look to what is valued and act accordingly. Shifts in tenure and promotion standards toward more research and publication requirements along with other rewards for faculty conducting research and securing funding are ways to place more focus on scholarship. Faculty will do what is rewarded.

Faculty at different career stages may require different types of support. New faculty just starting out in their careers are working toward establishing a research agenda at the same time they are often teaching for the first time and preparing new courses. Mid-career faculty members often carry the burden of faculty leadership and may find time torn between the goals of research, teaching, and new administrative duties. Late-career CMU faculty may have focused primarily on teaching functions in the past given the historic mission of teaching at

\textsuperscript{28} Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998, Rice, 1996
\textsuperscript{29} Alexander-Snow and Johnson (1999)
CMU. Shifts in expectations for research for this cadre of faculty may require retooling to create new or expanded lines of research or the development of research support roles such as assuming administrative and leadership positions.

Most see our tradition of departmental control over professional matters as a great strength of CMU. However, the diversity of expectations outlined in departmental bylaws results in differential research expectations for tenure and promotion decisions. Other issues are different understandings of what types of research are valued and the departmental expectations regarding the balance of teaching and research. As research becomes more emphasized at CMU, it is important to consider the changing landscape when developing ways to encourage and support scholarly endeavors. The starting point should be first to determine how scholarship is to be defined and thus valued and rewarded. Then the reward and support structures must be developed. It must be recognized that choosing to have more focus on research means, by default, that fewer resources will be available for other uses, which includes how faculty time will be distributed.

Discussion Points:

Should there be more commonality among departmental bylaws concerning research expectations, especially within a college?

How can CMU provide for faculty needs that recognizes the variability of these needs over the span of a faculty career?

**QUESTION 6**

What are the barriers and challenges, as well as the opportunities, related to achieving increased scholarship and national prominence, and what are reasonable expectations for faculty or for departments?

In addressing this question, the self-study will include workload, reward structures, and external funding among the topics discussed.\[30\]

CMU, like all institutions, is evolving and will continue to evolve in response to changes in society, in its student population and in the expectations of its constituencies. At present, the university is, for the first time, collectively contemplating a change that has the potential to impact its traditional strong focus on teaching.

The transition to an institution with increased emphasis on scholarship must take into account the perspectives and aspirations of the university stakeholders. Factors which must be considered include:

- the faculty collective bargaining agreement;
- the campus history and culture of shared governance;
- the historically collegial atmosphere at CMU;

---

30 The original form of the question was “What opportunities, challenges and barriers exist that impact the transition to being an institution with increased emphasis on scholarship and national prominence?” Thus, portions were not directly addressed in the report of the Special Emphasis Subcommittee.
• direction from the CMU Board of Trustees;
• the expectations of our students for a quality education; and
• the professional aspirations of faculty members.

The barriers, challenges and opportunities related to achieving increased national prominence must be addressed with these factors in mind and cognizant that at times these may not be aligned. We first discuss the opportunities the new focus provides, and then discuss the challenges. One can define barriers as challenges that cannot be overcome. Potential barriers will be discussed as challenges, because if they turn out to be truly insurmountable then it will be impossible for CMU to achieve its vision.

6.1 OPPORTUNITIES

6.1.1 The opportunity to define ourselves

Boyer, in his landmark *Scholarship Reconsidered*,31 contends that universities such as CMU should not try to emulate major research centers. He argues regarding historically regional universities that

Rather than determining their own goals and confidently shaping their own distinctive missions, campuses seek to emulate research centers. . . . By believing themselves to be what they are not . . . institutions fall short of being what they could be.

We urge, then, that every higher learning institution define its own special mission and develop a system of faculty recognition that relates to what the campus is seeking to accomplish. . . . Each college or university should, of course, view teaching as a core requirement. We can also imagine that even within institutions, different priorities may prevail from one department or division to another. And even within departments, there could be a “mosaic of talent.”

Central Michigan University is one of 15 autonomous state universities, each with its own, independent governing board. The legislature exerts some control through annual appropriations and the governor exerts some influence through the appointment of trustees, but Michigan does not have centralized control of higher education. Thus, we have the opportunity to define for ourselves what we mean by saying that we will transition to increased scholarship and national prominence.

The CMU community should soon undertake a discussion to more clearly identify what it considers as an appropriate level of research activity and to define the degree of increased emphasis in this area. We need to identify priority activities that we wish to promote.

Discussion point:

What is an appropriate research level for CMU?

6.1.2 The opportunity to use budget allocations to increase scholarly activity

CMU is resource-poor compared to most of the other state universities in Michigan. We consistently and historically have ranked from 12th to 14th in tuition revenues and in state appropriations. *U.S. News and World Report* ranks us about 210 out of 248 national doctoral universities (see Table 8-1). An analysis of the factors used for their rankings shows that we are near the very bottom in those categories that involve resources but show respectfully well in many other categories. In spite of its modest budget, CMU is very efficient and effective using the resources that it has.

The university has conducted substantive budget reviews of all units within the last few years in response to the State’s decreases in appropriations, callbacks and mandates to limit tuition and fees increases. Only recently, however, have budget reductions not been across-the-board cuts. Combining a bleak budget picture for the near future with an increased emphasis on research demands that the reviews of internal allocations continue. We have the opportunity to produce change through budgeting. In doing so, we must be smart in deciding what to support and, where appropriate, what we no longer want to support. The CMU community should continue analysis of and discussions about allocations and utilization of its resources in light of the goal of transitioning to a university with a greater emphasis on research.

6.1.3 The opportunity to better utilize the strengths of the faculty and staff

In general, the tenure-track faculty members who have been attracted to CMU in the past few decades have very good qualifications. Many have had significant research experience elsewhere. But those who come to CMU are seeking to build careers that provide a balance in both teaching and research responsibilities rather than primarily as researchers.

Although well-prepared for scholarship, many faculty members focus little on this area given the time requirements of other responsibilities, generally teaching but also service in some cases. We have a great opportunity to enhance the scholarship level at CMU by taking advantage of the available but under-utilized research expertise.

At the same time, the institutional vision of increasing research can be fostered through new hires. There can be a research expectation for new appointments, provided of course that sufficient time and resources for the research will be available.

Discussion point:

How can we best utilize the strengths of the existing corps of faculty members and what strengths do we see as important for new faculty members?
6.1.4 The opportunity to excel in scholarship in its widest sense

The university mission statement calls upon CMU to be a "nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, research and creative activity, and public service." One could assume that the research aspect will be basic research. Heeding the caution of Boyer that institutions like CMU should not attempt to mimic major research universities and using his broad definition of research and scholarship, we have the opportunity to excel in the scholarship of application by focusing on one or more of the other components of the vision — academic excellence, creative activity, and public service. This does not mean we forsake basic research, but it does suggest where an emphasis might be — research in applied areas where CMU already has a good track record. Some examples might be being known and respected for pedagogical research (related to academic excellence), a respected theatre department (creative activity), or service learning (public service).

The CMU community should discuss and prioritize its opportunities for research and service. This should be done in light of both transitioning to a university with a greater scholarship and national prominence and CMU’s other needs and available resources.

Discussion Point:

Should CMU emphasize applied research or creative endeavors over basic research?

6.1.5 The opportunity to attract higher quality students and faculty and increased funding

An increase in national prominence will mean that CMU will have better opportunities to promote itself when recruiting both students and employees. This is demonstrated by an area in which CMU already enjoys some national prominence — in certain athletic areas (wrestling, gymnastics). CMU’s reputation allows successfully recruitment of top student-athletes from across the country. National prominence in areas of academics or research and/or in unique programming (e.g., service learning) would similarly strengthen our recruitment of students and faculty.

With regard to funding, increased prominence will help convince external parties that we are a resource in which to invest state, federal or foundation dollars. CMU will not need to “sell itself” as a complete unknown — using the national name could open doors that might not otherwise be available. Greater national prominence will enhance development activities as well.
6.2 CHALLENGES

A transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence presents CMU with opportunities, but it also presents significant challenges. The most critical challenges involve financial issues, setting priorities, and faculty roles and rewards.

6.2.1 The challenge of working with limited resources

This issue, among all the challenges, poses perhaps the greatest obstacle. The university’s budget for a given fiscal year is predicated on a state appropriation plus the attainment of certain numbers of student credit hours (SCH). This is the business side of the university that most stakeholders accept as fact, or at least as a necessary evil.

As referenced earlier, both CMU’s state funding and tuition rates are quite low compared to other universities with similar missions. In addition, like many public universities, our development efforts are not yet sufficiently mature to generate substantial revenue for academic programs. Limited resources mean we can only do so much. CMU has recently identified several institutional priorities and started developing ways to address them. It is imperative that CMU follow through on these initiatives. Now that the priorities are set, there must be the resolve to make the difficult decisions necessary to implement them. The decisions must take into account our finite budget and balancing the goal of transitioning to more research with the aspirations of faculty, the needs of students, and the needs of the state and country. When decisions are made, the rationale and possible implications need to be communicated to the campus community in a timely manner.  

Discussion Points:

- The university should decide how it chooses to prioritize its activities in a timely fashion and within the parameters of shared governance and collective bargaining.
- The CMU community should discuss setting its priorities, which may include deciding what not to do or to no longer support.
- The community should examine its activities and discuss changes that will free up more time for research and scholarly activity.

6.2.2 The challenge of managing the internal competition for resources

Tight budgets produce tensions due to the internal competition for resources. Important, as CMU moves toward its vision, will be the tension between achieving the expected student credit hours (revenues) and the goal of increased research. The current budgeting model attributes revenue to colleges with a breakdown by

---

32 One instance when a decision about priorities was made was when the Board of Trustees determined CMU would remain with a Division I-A athletic program. One can debate whether this was a smart decision or whether CMU can really afford it, but a priority was decided. What was not done was provide the rationale for this decision nor was there any communication of what may we have to stop doing to support this priority.
individual departments. Revenue projections for departments are adjusted using the “provost subsidy,” which in many cases is negative. Those departments where tuition revenue is “taken away” may feel disenfranchised and see something sinister in the budget process. In fact, it simply makes abundantly clear that some programs are more expensive than others, but a result is anxiety by units over their SCH production.

This anxiety can lead to SCH production being seen as the end rather than as a means to the end result of supporting instruction, research and service. Competition between units for student credit hours can lead to ill-conceived curricular proposals or maintaining traditional curricular requirements which otherwise would have undergone revision, replacement or elimination long ago. Likewise, grant proposal activity can become askew when the goal of the proposals is simply to obtain the funds rather than support original or creative ideas. Unfortunately there will be little opportunity to relieve the tension as long as the University resources remain about where they are today.

If the current budget model is maintained, the CMU community needs to find ways to make it not be seen as punitive. Revisions in the budget model might ease some of the tension between SCH revenue expectations and increasing scholarship if the costs of supporting research were more clearly separated.

Discussion Points:

What are ways to make the current budget model not be seen as a punitive one?

Should revisions be made in the current budget model?

6.2.3 The challenge of defining faculty work responsibilities

The faculty collective bargaining contract defines the workload for tenure-track faculty in broad terms. Article 17 states:

The workload of bargaining unit members encompasses many professional duties and responsibilities necessary to their varied roles. Faculty have considerable discretion in carrying out their professional duties and responsibilities. . . . These duties normally include but are not limited to:

1. Teaching and/or providing instructional support . . .

2. Advising and consulting with students

3. Engaging in scholarly and creative activity

4. Support the proper and efficient functioning of the department, college and University as a whole . . .

5. Supporting the University and broader academic community through professional or public service related to the bargaining unit member’s discipline.

The department and dean share responsibility for appropriate faculty workloads. With respect to the establishment of appropriate faculty workloads, departmental faculty may, in accordance with . . . their
department . . . bylaws, make recommendations concerning said workloads. These recommendations may include the definition of a full-time workload. . . . In the development of workload recommendations, the following guidelines apply to teaching faculty:

a. The instructional portion of a faculty member's full-time workload consists of nine (9) to twelve (12) credit hours per semester as determined by the department.

b. Adjustments to her/his instructional workload may be made for various academic purposes, such as curricular or professional development activities, advising responsibilities, and supervision of theses or dissertations. . . .

Adjusted workloads shall be recommended by the department and approved by the dean.

Thus, the contractual expectations for faculty work have three separate components: instructional activities (including advising), scholarly and creative activity, and service activities. There are questions, however, about how a given faculty member’s time should be apportioned and how much variability should there be in instructional loads from one individual to another.

All department bylaws speak, usually relative to promotion and tenure, to the expectations for publication or equivalent demonstrations of scholarly and creative activities. Most have no mention at all of how the time spent in this area should be considered in the determination of overall load. Some department bylaws specifically address expected instructional loads; others are silent. For those that do, some give load consideration for classes beyond certain sizes and some reduce instructional loads for administrative assignments. However, very few specifically allow for an adjusted teaching load to accommodate an expectation for enhanced research and scholarly activity.33

A challenge will be to have the CMU community more clearly identify and delineate faculty responsibilities and reach some agreement on how scholarly activity should be considered in faculty workload. The discussion should address:

- how instructional loads should be determined (there is currently wide variation), and
- the issue of total faculty workload and whether differences in instructional workloads are appropriate (and if so, the pros and cons of such a policy).

CMU needs to compare total workload data with peer institutions. To provide a realistic comparison, the workload analysis should be accompanied by the expected outcomes of the workload components (teaching, research and service). This will not be easy. The collective

---

33 One department that does address this issue is Psychology, which requires a 4-4 load for those who haven't published in four years, and a 2-2 for those who are active researchers and serve on theses and dissertation committees.
bargaining environment limits surveys of faculty on work-related issues, and CMU currently has little hard data on faculty workload.

6.2.4 The challenge of defining the criteria for rewarding faculty

CMU has two principal reward structures in place. The first is awards for exceptional performance, either in scholarship or teaching. University wide, CMU bestows recognition and professional development funds of $1,200 to four successful faculty members annually through the President’s and Provost’s Awards.\(^{34}\) There are also several award programs at the college and department level. An example of an award designed to encourage research was a College of Business program that awarded $500 in professional development funds to each faculty member who published a peer-reviewed article. Most college and department recognitions, however, have no monetary considerations as part of the award.

The second reward system is based on the collectively bargained provisions of the Faculty Agreement, which generally has a three-year duration. The agreement specifies the salary adjustments for promotion and the annual pay increases. The annual adjustments usually have been across-the-board increases according to rank — either fixed percent or fixed dollar plus fixed percent increases. This is the case for all three years under the current agreement.

Only one contract contained a provision for differential increases based on perceived performance differences (“merit” adjustments). Nevertheless, since the 1980s CMU has had the following merit provision:

A bargaining unit member who has held the rank of Professor at Central Michigan University for four (4) or more years may apply for an increase in salary base. The criteria, standards and processes by which such an applicant is judged for this award shall be those established . . . for promotion to Professor.\(^{35}\)

Thus, a faculty member with full professor rank may be “re-promoted” every four years by again satisfying during that period the teaching, publication, and service standards for promotion. The financial adjustment for this award, variously called “professor salary adjustment,” “professor supplement,” etc., is the same as that for promotion from associate to full professor. Since the implementation of the professor salary adjustment policy in the mid-1980s, some full professors have received a professor salary adjustment five times.

---

\(^{34}\) The Provost’s Award for Outstanding Research and Creative Activity recognizes the achievements of two faculty members with less than seven years experience since their terminal degree; the President’s Award for Outstanding Research and Creative Activity recognizes the achievements of senior faculty members.

\(^{35}\) paragraph 22 of section 14 of the 2002-05 Agreement
The primary reward system at CMU is therefore through promotion through the ranks from assistant to associate to full professor and then professor salary adjustments. The *CMUFA and CMU Agreement* specifies the criteria for promotion as:

* Demonstrated achievements in . . .
  a) Teaching . . .
  b) Scholarly and creative activity
  c) Professional growth . . .
  d) University service

It further specifies that, “*The criteria and standards should provide specific guidance to bargaining unit members...*” (Article 10) and “…*these written standards form the basis not only for departmental evaluations but also for subsequent evaluations at higher levels.*” (Article 14, paragraph 1)

A critical point as CMU seeks increased emphasis on research is how the decisions on promotions will be made.

- Will future personnel decisions be more influenced by research productivity than on teaching?
- How is productivity to be measured?
- What qualifies as research and who gets to determine the “quality” in particular instances?

In answering these questions, we should consider to what extent there should be some systematic university-wide processes and benchmark setting. Should department bylaws, which set the standards for faculty promotion and tenure decisions, include provisions such as, for example, a requirement for some form of external (to CMU) review of work?

Also, it is worthwhile to recall the recommendation of Boyer, in his landmark monograph Scholarship Reconsidered, that the reward system at universities be broadened and that individualized evaluation criteria be used.

> “. . . scholarship in its fullest sense must be acknowledged. This means not only broadening the reward system, but also creating flexible and varied career paths for professors. . . . What we propose, in short, is that faculty expectations and related evaluation not only be broadened but that they be individualized and continuous as well. If faculty are to build on their strengths and contribute to the institutions where they work, evaluation criteria must be tailored to personal talents, as well as campus needs. And it is especially important, we believe, that the criteria used reflect changing patterns of personal and professional growth across a lifetime.”

We note that Boyer does not call for a diminution of rigor; instead, he promotes a broadening of what is considered good scholarship coupled with rigorous assessment of the scholarships of teaching, discovery, integration and application. We are seeing a slow transformation in some disciplines of the very nature of scholarly work, such as annotated bibliographies on the Internet that have been reviewed. Should the quality and worth of such Web pages be measured by the number
of “hits”? It can be argued that the current reward system in higher education is quite constricting in terms of what activities are truly rewardable and rewarded. Indeed, the notion of external review can carry with it issues of conformity. As CMU moves toward a greater emphasis on research and national promise, it will have to deal with these issues.

As CMU seeks to become an institution with greater scholarship and national prominence, it would be worthwhile for the campus community to undertake a discussion of our current reward structure. The discussion should include such issues related to promotion and tenure as to what extent standards should be comparable across units, the level of involvement of faculty and administration in those decisions, the role quality and national recognition should play versus quantity in an evaluation, and Boyer’s broader view of what constitutes scholarship. The discussions need to be carried out in a manner consistent with our policies, heritage, and contractual agreements.

**Discussion Points:**

- How broad a definition of scholarship is appropriate to increase research? In its efforts to reach that goal, should CMU choose to be pioneer?
- To what extent should we vary from traditional forms of evaluation and values?
- Should CMU embrace Boyer’s definitions and axioms for the evaluation of faculty, and if so, to what extent?

### 6.2.5 The need for effective public relations efforts

Essential for an increase in national prominence is that others hear of what we are doing and of the quality of our work. Word of mouth may be effective for some purposes, such as recruiting undergraduates and, in some cases, graduate students. Print and electronic distribution of accomplishments are important for other audiences. Supporting faculty and staff participation in activities external to the university — such as conference presentations, artistic performances, and service opportunities — is necessary, especially for reaching peer groups.

**Discussion Point:**

- What improvements could be made in the ways and means CMU uses for disseminating information about its successes?

### 6.2.6 The need for good communication

Collaboration between CMU students, faculty, and administrators is key for the university to succeed in the transition to an increased emphasis on research. Poor communication can be a barrier to collaboration. A good part of the caviling outlined in some sections of this chapter can be attributed to the inability of the university faculty and administrators to maintain substantive dialog on the issues. The CMU community should examine the means by which it engages each of its stakeholders, both informally and formally, with the goal of increasing effective communication.

**Discussion Point:**
What steps can be taken to improve communication among the various sectors of the CMU community?

### 6.3 REASONABLE EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS AND DEPARTMENTS

A key question that CMU must wrestle with is how to determine the expectations for scholarship for faculty members. Answering this involves several related issues. One is the definition of scholarship, which has been discussed earlier. Another is how much variation there should be in research expectations among departments and disciplines, among faculty at different ranks, and/or among faculty with different primary assignments. A one-size-fits-all model would seem to be impractical. But should there be, say, some minimum level of scholarship expected for all faculty?

A third issue is deciding if scholarly expectations should be set for individuals or for units. In the former case, all faculty members would be expected to be involved in research to some degree and rewards would be based on an individual’s accomplishments. In the latter case, there would be institutional expectations for departments with the rewards based on departmental performance, regardless of whether it was achieved through contributions of all members of the unit, an active portion of the faculty, or even just one superstar.

**Discussion Points:**

- How much variation in scholarly expectations should there be?
- Should scholarly expectations be set for individuals or for units?

### 6.4 SECTION SUMMARY

The CMU community must decide how it chooses to implement the directive for greater emphasis on scholarship. The challenges are mostly financial and appropriately using one of our most precious resources — faculty time. The CMU community should decide whether, and if so how, it will address potential changes in its faculty reward structure and faculty workload structure to reflect an increase in emphasis of scholarship and national prominence. If it is agreed that this is a proper course of action, the CMU community should decide what changes are appropriate and how it should implement them.

### QUESTION 7

If changes are desired, how do we encourage timely decision making within our strong shared governance structure?

Central Michigan University has a strong culture of shared governance and an expectation of input from all stakeholders when making major decisions affecting the University. Obviously, effective communication is essential in such an environment. Lack of open communication during the 1990s resulted in significant dissatisfaction, which was reflected...
by the evaluators during our last accreditation review noting that “Governance is a concern, despite the presence of policies and governance structures, which are generally appropriate.”

CMU responded by carrying out a thorough study of its governance structures. The result was a document that identified the various parties and their roles in decision making. The major parties are the Board of Trustees (BOT), the Senior Administrative Officers (SO), the Academic Senate (AS) and its various committees, the CMU Faculty Association (FA), the academic colleges and departments, and students. It was hoped that the Matrix would lead to a better understanding of who was ultimately responsible and which groups should be consulted for different types of decisions and it was endorsed by both the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate.

The Shared Governance Matrix along with a new president committed to a more open form of administration reduced the level of complaints. Nevertheless, despite the relatively clear delineation of roles among the various stakeholders in the matrix, ambiguities and disagreements on procedures of governance continue to be raised. Some questions should be expected, and some questions are legitimate and necessary given our collective bargaining environment. Others seem to be rooted in lack of communication and misunderstanding. An important finding in this self-study, as discussed in Chapter 3, is that the various stakeholders hold different views on the purpose of the matrix. There is no widespread feeling by the faculty that our governance model needs major revision.

Participative management is not inherently a slow process. It does, however, require careful attention to communication and mutual trust between the involved parties. One can argue that this is particularly true in higher education where the major employee group — the faculty — has, by professional training, the tendency to question and analyze.

7.1 NEED FOR OPEN COMMUNICATION AMONG STAKEHOLDERS

Perhaps the most obvious need for timely decision making is effective communication among the stakeholders, especially between the administration (including the BOT) and the faculty (especially their representative bodies, the Academic Senate and the Faculty Association). Making decisions without adequate discussion may appear to be more efficient and avoids creating dissension over difficult choices. Many times, however, dealing with the reactions following the announcement of such a decision will be more time consuming and divisive than if these discussions had occurred before the decision was made. It is sound management practice to build as much support as possible when difficult choices are being made. This is especially critical in a culture that values shared decision making, such as at CMU (where it is even formalized).
Many faculty members feel this is an area in which CMU needs significant improvement. They cite a number of decisions related to the recent budget difficulties that were made without much public discussion — often in an effort to avoid alarming potentially affected parties — and based on incomplete data and lack of complete understanding of the effects.

### 7.2 NEED FOR MUTUAL TRUST AMONG STAKEHOLDERS

As well as good communication, there must also be a level of trust among the stakeholders. Building trust is, of course, closely tied to good communication. Mistrust can arise when one or more stakeholders is not informed nor consulted about a major decision or if the rationale for the decision is not clearly explained. Those left out of the loop feel their views were seen as not important. They may view the lack of communication as intentional, for some political purpose. Once there is a feeling of mistrust, parties on any side of an issue may tend to “read into” communications possible “hidden agendas,” even when there are no obvious reasons to suspect they exist.

### 7.3 OVERCOMING RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

The third area that must be considered, if changes are to be made in a timely manner within a strong shared governance structure, is how best to overcome inertia and resistance to change. Resistance to change is natural, particularly if the rationale for the suggested change is not clearly explained.

A proposed change can seem to imply that something is wrong with the status quo. This can engender a degree of defensiveness, especially among those most involved, unless the reasons for the suggested changes are completely articulated and a chance to respond provided. This will be particularly true if there is mistrust.

Comments about inertia and resistance to change are fairly common at CMU. It is important to note that the perceived resistance to change is not just the view of some administrators that faculty are reticent to changes in directions and/or policies. In some cases, faculty or staff members have been frustrated by the perceived reluctance of administrators to implement changes that might benefit a program and/or the university. Effectively implementing needed changes is essential if CMU is to make the desired transition to increased scholarship and national prominence.

### 7.4 A CASE STUDY

That the parameters of shared governance at CMU are still unclear, despite the Shared Governance Matrix, was demonstrated by the number and wide variety of contentious issues that were mentioned by the Special Emphasis Subcommittee in its report. These included how decisions were made, or should be made in the future, on such topics as:
• faculty workload policies (including setting expectations for scholarship and grant writing while ensuring FA protection of individuals);

• budgets (including establishing priorities and determining where cuts are made);

• restructuring the off-campus unit (the purpose and the direction this will go);

• partnerships with commercial industry (especially their wisdom and the real benefits and risks);

• CMU’s level of commitment to intercollegiate athletics;

• the new vision statement; and

• having a Special Emphasis in our accreditation self-study.

The latter three issues all caused considerable concern and dissatisfaction among some stakeholders, including members of the Academic Senate and the Faculty Association Board of Directors. We present the adoption of the new vision statement as a case study illustrating how problems of communication, mutual trust and perceived resistance to change can arise and impede timely decision making.

When the new vision statement, “CMU will be a nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, applied research, and public service,” was adopted by the Board of Trustees (BOT) in April 2004, many faculty members were surprised. They had no idea that a change was contemplated, even though the BOT had sent a survey to the campus community seeking input on a proposed revision. Some were not particularly upset, feeling that the new statement would have little actual effect and suffer from the same almost universal neglect as the previous statement, but others felt disenfranchised, perceiving the BOT as unilaterally setting a significantly new direction for the University. How “national prominence” would be defined and the meaning of “applied research” were sources of concern to various constituencies. These concerns became more evident as the process of developing a plan for pursuing the vision unfolded. In response to faculty concerns, the BOT eventually accepted recommendations to modify “applied research” to the more inclusive “research and creative activity” which is the common terminology at CMU for all forms of faculty scholarship, and affirm that seeking national prominence was not to be an end in itself, but to be achieved through recognized academic excellence, research, and public service.

Despite the fact that developing the most recent vision statement was a much more inclusive process than in the past, allowing the entire campus community the opportunity to provide input on the vision, and later on fleshing out the details of how CMU will attempt to achieve it, many still did not feel they had had a voice in determining CMU’s future. Clearly, the consultative expectation of the Shared Governance Matrix to involve departments, deans, and the Academic Senate in major decisions was met meagerly, at best. This raises several questions.
Why was the CMU community not more aware of and involved in the formulation of the new vision statement? Why does the BOT think that this specific direction is important? Did the BOT believe that the campus community would be resistant to change unless a direction was imposed? How much support, outside of the BOT, is there for a transition into an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence? Was the adoption of the related special emphasis topic in our accreditation efforts an attempt to further an agenda under the guise of faculty support? Are some of the faculty who oppose this direction reacting because their career focus (e.g., less emphasis on research) does not fit well with this vision? Are some opposed because they expect certain departments will receive special attention and funding?

Obviously, there was a lack of communication. The unanswered questions produced mistrust, causing some to say this was an intentional bypassing of shared governance by the BOT. They also led to resistance to participating in the process of fleshing out the plan to pursue the vision. Does this resistance reflect the sense of disenfranchisement and objections to how the vision statement was adopted, or is it a sign of disagreement with the direction established by the BOT, i.e. should CMU really be attempting this type of transition? Is some of the resistance due to personal interests rather than those of CMU? Whatever the answers, if CMU is to make progress toward its vision this resistance must be overcome without inducing significant divisiveness. The issues of open communication and trust between all stakeholders and the different views on the role of the Shared Governance Matrix in decision-making need to be addressed if timely progress is going to occur.

7.5 SECTION SUMMARY

As detailed above, there are challenges to timely decision-making in the context of a strong shared governance structure but it is not impossible. First, it is important to make the distinction between issues that need to be resolved quickly and those that are less time-sensitive and can afford significant deliberation. Whenever possible, attempts should be made to involve all stakeholders in major decisions that impact them. The role of the Shared Governance Matrix must be clarified and the accepted processes followed, and token involvement of stakeholders in the process for the sake of expediency avoided. On the other hand, ways must be found to implement needed changes in spite the resistance of vested interest groups, at times a vocal minority at odds with the wishes of the majority of the stakeholders.

For CMU, it appears that either the existing lines of communication need to be utilized more effectively, or that new avenues of communication between CMU’s stakeholders need to be devised. There are several important questions to which CMU needs answers:

- What is the role of the Shared Governance Matrix and does it need revision?
• How can overdue changes be implemented when opposed by vested interest groups?
• Should faculty have more input into priorities and budgetary decisions?
• What are the ways to facilitate greater degrees of mutual trust and ensure honest and forthright communication?
• What are the mechanisms that can circumvent an “us” against “them” culture in a collective bargaining environment and promote a strong commitment to shared governance?

These questions need to be adequately addressed if CMU hopes to make progress and develop procedures that will allow us to move toward our vision of an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence.

**SUMMARY**

The special emphasis of our institutional self-study was on “Making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence.” The decision to focus on this topic was in direct response to the recent adoption by CMU’s Board of Trustees of a new vision statement: “CMU will be a nationally prominent university known for integrity, academic excellence, research and creative activity, and public service.” The new vision partially reflects the fact that scholarship is increasing in importance at CMU.

A committee (the Special Emphasis Subcommittee) was charged with identifying the issues — but without suggesting solutions given our collective bargaining environment — that need to be considered as CMU attempts to transition from an institution that is predominantly focused on undergraduate education to one that will strive towards increased national prominence in, among other things, its scholarly activities. While this chapter focused mainly on the effects of increasing research and creative activity, it is emphasized that “academic excellence” is another key element of the vision statement. As such, the transition into a university that places more emphasis on scholarship should occur without sacrificing the quality of its undergraduate programs.

A key finding was that the CMU community resists the idea that increased scholarship should come at the expense of solid teaching and academic excellence. Most faculty members support increasing scholarly activity at CMU, but adhere to the philosophy that a major role of expanded research is to enhance opportunities for student learning. It is felt that if CMU plans this transition in a careful and deliberate manner, it can avoid some of the pitfalls that have plagued other institutions in attempting similar transitions. We also believe that CMU could benefit substantially from advice that the Higher Learning Commission and its consultant-evaluators have to offer. Two critical questions are:
Are there universities similar to CMU which have been able to make a successful transition (i.e., increased their prominence in scholarship while also increasing their reputations for academic excellence). If so, how did they do it?

Our exploration of the issues involved in transitioning into an institution with a greater emphasis on research revealed four major issues that must be addressed with the involvement of all stakeholders:

- The need for clear measures of national prominence;
- The need for faculty to have more time to engage in scholarly activities;
- The need to align our budgeting with agreed-to institutional priorities; and
- The need for more trust and open communication, especially between the faculty and the administration.

Identifying realistic measures and benchmarks that can indicate progress toward increased scholarship and national prominence will not be easy. As an outgrowth of the new vision statement, the Vision Planning Steering Committee began the work of fleshing out a comprehensive strategic plan, including identifying the key elements and the objective benchmarks that can be used to measure CMU’s relative standing and improvement over time. Here we have pointed out several potential problems with utilizing “traditional” metrics for national prominence, such as those used in the rankings of U.S. News and World Report. Nevertheless, to achieve recognition nationally, it will be necessary to either meet some already-accepted measures or to convince audiences of the validity of new metrics. For example, it may be difficult to compete with well-known schools in the area of enrolling for outstanding students. However, CMU might be able to gain positive national recognition by showing, with convincing data, that our students learned more during their time at CMU relative to those at most other schools. Our relative “gain” score on nationally-normed field tests or tests of general knowledge might be a more reasonable measure for use by CMU. Similarly, in terms of research, it may be difficult for CMU to ever compete, except perhaps in specific niche areas, with major research universities when the more “traditional” measures of research prominence are used (e.g., number of publications or grants, number of citations). However, CMU might be able to gain national prominence from other research-related measures, such as the number of students involved in capstone courses involving research or the percentage of students who published or present scholarly or creative works. Consultation from the Higher Learning Commission may help in identifying realistic measures for CMU, which in turn would help us steer in directions that maximize the chances that our efforts to attain national prominence will be successful.

The issue of providing faculty more time to engage in scholarly activities is crucial to increasing the level of scholarship at CMU. Our analysis indicates that without major investments in the faculty, it will be difficult
to transition into a more research-active institution while maintaining our traditional commitment to teaching excellence. This raises a number of questions:

- Are there creative ways for providing more time for research or are new faculty positions and reduced teaching loads required? How have other institutions who have made successful transitions accomplished this?

- Should the “mosaic of talent,” in Boyer’s words, within a department be more recognized to allow faculty who excel in scholarship to spend more time doing research, while faculty who excel in teaching are able to focus on this? Is it possible to implement this model within our present governance and reward structures?

- Is there really resistance to expanding our “mosaics” and reward structures to allow for a wider range of alternative workloads? If not, should expectations for successful efforts at scholarship and obtaining external funding be increased for those who have a reduced teaching load?

- Should our understanding of scholarship be changed to include the broader aspects described by Boyer?

- Should CMU consider hiring “lecturers” or more “temporary” faculty members to allow more research time for regular faculty? Or, should CMU focus on hiring only faculty members who excel in both teaching and research, but set enrollments at a more manageable level?

Again, CMU could benefit significantly from consultation with the HLC consultant-evaluators in helping to identify ways in which our faculty could spend more time on scholarly activities, without compromising academic excellence in our classrooms.

A third major issue that emerged several times in our exploration of issues surrounding transitioning CMU into an institution with a greater national prominence has to do with budgets and priorities. CMU has traditionally recruited faculty who are expected to successfully balance excellence in teaching and scholarship, and many do so. Clearly, if CMU is to increase the scholarship side without sacrificing academic excellence there will need to be a source of new revenue. One cannot just ask the faculty to do more. Some basic questions here are:

- Should CMU significantly raise its tuition, even at the cost of losing some state allocations? What would be the consequences?

- Should CMU consider major changes in its budgeting process? Should faculty have a greater say in the institutional priorities and where investments are made? For example, are our investments in such areas as Division IA status in intercollegiate athletics and the Research Center in the best interests of the university?

- Does CMU have the resolve to make differential budget and program cuts during economic downturns and the resolve to
invest in specific programs in light of what will bring more national prominence? Who will make these determinations and what criteria will be used?

Clearly, CMU could benefit from consultation and education about how other universities have addressed these critical issues.

Finally, the topic of open communication and trust emerged several times in our study. The issues can be exemplified by our “case study” of the driving force of the special emphasis, CMU’s new vision statement. Despite attempts by the Board of Trustees (BOT) to seek input from the campus community before the statement was adopted, there is a perception by many faculty members that the vision was a top-down mandate. This, in turn, reaffirmed long-held perceptions that the BOT does not value faculty input on major issues, in this case the general direction the University should be taking. The result was considerable resistance on the part of some faculty members to engage in the process of addressing how to move toward the vision: determining our priorities, strategies and measures of progress.

Some faculty members scoffed at the notion of “national prominence.” Others felt disenfranchised by the use of the term “applied research.” In response, the BOT revised “applied research” to the more inclusive “research and creative activity.” They also clarified that national prominence was not to be an end in itself, but something to be achieved through academic excellence, research, and public service. While these actions addressed concerns about the vision statement’s language, they also underlined the feeling of many on campus that the process of crafting the new vision statement was flawed and lacked the open communication needed from the onset. Had a more concerted effort been made to involve all stakeholders from the beginning, the entire process would have been smoother and the vision would have received much more support. Clearly, CMU could use consultation on how we can open better avenues of communication and enhance trust among all its stakeholders. Are there better models of governance, and/or should CMU re-evaluate its governance structure?

These four major themes do not encompass all of the critical issues that need to be addressed if CMU is to be successful in transitioning toward increased scholarship and national prominence. There are likely issues that were overlooked. However, it was clear that the four themes of defining and measuring what we mean by “national prominence,” finding ways to allow faculty to become more engaged in research, evaluating our budgetary processes in light of institutional priorities, and increasing the trust and communication among CMU’s stakeholders are critical issues. It is our hope that CMU will benefit from this focused study, as well as from advice from the HLC, to help our transition into a more highly-visible and positively-recognized university — one that someday will have nationally prominence in many areas.
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CHAPTER 9
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Findings*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission and Vision</td>
<td>• CMU has a comprehensive set of mission documents. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some faculty members do not believe that the current vision aligns well with the focus needed at CMU. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>• Integrity has been adopted as a specific institutional priority and key performance indicators have been identified. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMUs policies and procedures for addressing complaints have been in place and working well for many years. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>• Despite reduced state allocations, CMU remains fiscally sound as a result of careful planning and budgeting. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operating costs new buildings have placed additional strain on the budget. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Enhancement</td>
<td>• The investment in private fundraising efforts has produced significant increases in alumni relations activity and private support. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There have been significant increases in grant proposal submissions and in grants awarded in the past five years. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMUs governmental relations efforts have increased and have made gains in protecting CMUs interests and in securing funding. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>• 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, CMU 2010, which should begin to meet the university's needs in this area. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining competitiveness in an increasingly competitive marketplace for talented students, faculty and staff and educational services needs to be part of CMUs long-range planning. (4, 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMU needs a formal long-term enrollment management plan. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is the potential for duplicating services or offering competing programs because of the lack of centralized planning and coordination. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Data Management</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMU lacks a formal process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of new initiatives to ensure the appropriate allocation of fiscal resources. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Chapters in which findings are discussed appear in parentheses.
Table 9-1. Summary of Findings by Key Areas (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Findings*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The university has developed valuable solid partnerships with external entities. (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The infrastructure to support grant and contract activity is inadequate to address current and expected increases in activity. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>• Enhancing diversity is an institutional priority and CMU 2010 identifies and strategies and key performance indicators. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Campuswide there is little knowledge of how CMU is progressing on the Diversity Plan and data need to be disseminated more effectively. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and</td>
<td>• The university has established teaching and learning as the highest priority and made significant steps to raise academic standards. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>• CMU has extensively invested in services to improve the teaching effectiveness of its faculty (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMU offers good experiential learning opportunities that include opportunities developed through partnering efforts with external groups. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMU students in general are actively engaged in a wide variety of co-curricular activities and view CMU as supportive of these experiences. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMU’s restructured program review process focuses on student learning outcomes and continuous improvement and makes use of external peer review. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CMU’s complex curricular structure hinders assessment and advising. (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a need for improved integration of international experiences into academic programs to enhance students’ understanding of global perspectives. (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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, ProEd, 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.
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Office of Student Disability Services 60
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recent enrollment growth 9
total enrollments on campus and off campus 9
student fees
fee for campus improvements 88
technology fee 88
student internships 137, 152, 192–193, 217
Student Ombuds Office 62
Student Opinion Survey (SOS) 96
student organizations 163
student services
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online registration 76
Student Service Court 76
student work experiences 163–164
summer camps for youth 219
T
teacher education programs
Alternate Route to Teacher Education 93, 223
and surveys of student teacher performance 189
Department of Educational Administration and Community Leadership (EACL) 223
partnerships with K-12 school districts 152, 222
Provisional Admission Program 93
review by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) 114
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End of Course Survey (ProfEd) 131
Student Opinion Survey (SOS) 96–97, 130
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2003 Report on Instructional Technology at CMU 148
assessments of technology instructional resources 144
dissemination of techniques by Faculty Champions 127, 150
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mediated classrooms 148, 304
student and faculty training in 150
student technology fees 88
technical staff to support 151
trouble-shooting support 151
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transfer student assistance 222
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U.S. News & World Report ratings of CMU and its programs 229, 244–245
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University Community Advisory Panel (UCAP) 55
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V
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and letters of support for 230
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writing
assessment of student writing competency 144, 182–183
Writing across the University Program (WAUP) 178, 181, 183
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CMU, an AA/EO institution, strongly and actively strives to increase diversity within its community (see http://www.cmich.edu/aaeo/).