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ADVANCEMENT SECTION

I. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION

The team believes that Central Michigan University sees its shift to an institutional culture of increased research and scholarship as an evolutionary and necessary change to stay competitive and grow in emerging areas of knowledge that build upon its areas of historical strength. Team members applaud the University’s decision to focus on the topic, “Making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence,” and the considerable thought that has already been invested in making this new vision a reality. Making the transition is at the heart of this shift in focus. The self-study as well as the team’s on-campus interviews demonstrate that CMU faculty, students and staff have an excellent awareness of the challenges and opportunities that such a shift presents. CMU has already taken important steps towards this change. Team members found a pervasive sense of imminent change and an understanding of the direction and understanding of the scope of that change, namely the charge from the Trustees to become a nationally prominent institution with an increased emphasis on scholarly and creative activity.

The team greatly appreciates the care and thoughtfulness with which the Special Emphasis section was prepared. It is particularly well written, forthright, reflective, and honest. The balanced discussion of the points certainly attests to CMU’s culture of integrity. While the team applauds the concise list of questions and discussion points presented for review, as consultants from thirteen very different universities, it assures that there is not one correct answer for each of these questions, and, furthermore, that CMU’s own answers are the most appropriate and relevant for itself. Consequently, the team has chosen to address five broad topics related to CMU’s special emphasis, which we believe will lay the foundation for CMU leaders to respond to the seven questions addressed in the self-study: (1) transforming the institutional culture; (2) identifying “niches of notice”; (3) targeting indicators of distinction which will help to measure progress made in the niches of notice; (4) leveraging institutional investments needed to reach new prominence; and (5) articulating key progress steps needed to ensure success in reaching institutional prominence.

The team observes that the questions may not be posed in the most constructive way because they posed some issues as debates rather than seeking consensus. For instance, the Special Emphasis chapter, while thorough and well-reasoned, at times appears to set activities of the university in opposition to each other. For example, in the Special Emphasis chapter there appears to be an opposition between focusing on graduate versus undergraduate education and research versus teaching, rather than seeing each pair in a close synergetic relationship. The identification of “niches of notice” may well not be based primarily upon particular programs, or be based solely on CMU’s historical strengths, but rather on a combination of existing and emerging scholarly areas in which CMU desires to invest.
Some organizational planning will be necessary to maintain the forward momentum to increase research and scholarship begun with the self-study. CMU has an organizational structure with very strong faculty participation and an unusual degree of self-determination at the unit/department level. This has obvious benefits but may present obstacles when a major shift in direction is proposed for the whole university. In the team’s experience, strategies developed to address all five topics discussed are necessary elements of an institutional change process. We offer our observations on them for your consideration as a practical approach to a process of change at CMU.

II. CONSULTATIONS OF THE TEAM

A. Topic One: Transforming the Institutional Culture

CMU 2010 states that “CMU recognizes the importance of research and creative activity to the quality of the education it provides to graduate and undergraduate students,” and calls for CMU to gain national prominence in the area of research and scholarship. Although this vision does build on some major strengths of the University, it also clearly sets CMU on a new path and thus requires a cultural or attitudinal shift for many members of the CMU community. John Lombardi, then President of the University of Florida, in a presentation in the 1990s explained that increasing research and scholarship lends itself well to make a paradigm shift in institutional culture because it is the activity that is truly “market driven and nationally referenced.” Thus, in the context of the Special Emphasis chapter, increased research and scholarship that is market driven and nationally referenced could take CMU to “national prominence.” CMU 2010 clearly states that the CMU communities “encourage[s] communications regarding the mission to emphasize that national prominence is our vision because we will be an institution, doing the type and quality of work that draws and deserves national recognition.”

Lombardi furthermore explained that assuming that a university represents a normal curve or distribution, it is actually at the margin it begins to make a change, not at the center; that it needs to add to the leading edge to bring about the change and take away from the trailing edge. Resources may be put on the front end for scholarship and research creating more opportunities for faculty to acquire resources to enhance their research. As faculty respond to these opportunities and they will, the norm then shifts to another place. If for a few years, resources are put on the leading edge, the center of the curve shifts, and the university succeeds in fostering the action and successes it wants. The high standard set at the leading edge – the standard of nationally referenced scholarship and research -- inevitably informs other standards in the university. Undergraduate and graduate programs alike are the beneficiaries of that high standard. Lombardi’s model may well be appropriate to CMU’s aspirations to achieve national prominence.

In 2001, President Rao stated in his report to the Board of Trustees that CMU “has great potential - potential that should be realized. With revenues well below the national average, leveraging opportunities through external constituencies will be key to realizing CMU's potential to achieve national status.” Thus the recognition to leverage strengths through external constituencies is part of the tradition of the institution.

President Rao identified a strength of CMU when he stated that, “This administration needs to work toward overcoming the university’s reputation as a ‘best kept secret’
CMU cannot be viewed as an average state university, but, instead, as a new kind of university that, with its niche baccalaureate through doctoral degrees, meets the needs of a new marketplace: a university that meets the needs of a new economy." Despite these and his other public statements on CMU 2010, the CMU self-study and on-campus interviews revealed that some faculty and administrators do not fully grasp the rationale behind this new emphasis, or they perceive scholarship and teaching to be at cross purposes. Thus, CMU leaders should consider working intensely, even within a short timeframe, with faculty, students, and staff to develop a clear rationale for why and how research and teaching as well as graduate and undergraduate education are mutually enhancing and synergistic at the University.

Underpinning this rationale should be a broad definition of scholarship which may be based on Boyer’s categories (scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching) and which fits the needs, strengths, and resources of CMU’s faculty and students. In other words, CMU needs to develop a shared and inclusive definition of scholarship that is distinct from other competitor research-intensive institutions and that is uniquely suited to the passions and strengths of the CMU community. Noteworthy is the fact that in addition to strength in research and creative activity, CMU has a long-standing commitment to quality liberal arts teaching and is known as a student learning-centered campus. That being the case, Boyer's model certainly does have application as CMU seeks to define scholarship in all areas, including the scholarship of teaching. In describing recent Carnegie Foundation attention given to the scholarship of teaching, Hutchings and Huber write, "...the idea that teaching, when conducted with systematic attention to learning, might be considered a form of scholarship has been attractive to many in higher education....The scholarship of teaching holds special promise for improving student learning because it works within the culture of academe, inviting faculty to bring their skills, values, and commitments as scholars to their work as teachers.” CMU is poised to succeed in scholarly endeavors in this regard.

Throughout the self-study, the CMU administration and constituencies have clearly identified its peer group (Ball State, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and others). For those individuals more comfortable with tangible examples, CMU could collectively also determine an aspirant group: what institutions does CMU see as “success stories” in the area of advancing scholarly productivity and prominence at doctoral-intensive public institutions? The Self Study and CMU personnel interviewed were explicit in who CMU does not intend to emulate, specifically the University of Michigan and Michigan State University on the one hand and Ferris State University and other regional campuses on the other. Who do you wish to emulate?

The team believes that CMU can better ensure a successful transformation by: (1) engaging existing governance structures in creative ways that involve key institutional leaders in crafting new strategic institutional initiatives; (2) focusing on and emphasizing key strengths of CMU and their translation to areas of identified challenge and/or opportunity which relate to the new vision; and (3) establishing open communication patterns to build trust and a sense of inclusion. Although these steps require time and energy, they will ensure a broader buy-in for CMU 2010 and its long-term viability. For example, given CMU’s historic strengths in teaching excellence, close faculty-student relationships, co-curricular events, student-centered programming as well as volunteer opportunities and internships, CMU members may consider constructing a more “action-oriented,” “collaborative or team-based,” “community-based” or “joint faculty-student” definition of research and scholarship. CMU, for instance, might be known as the site of “apprentice student scholars” who
work side-by-side with accomplished faculty researchers throughout the inquiry process. Such a definition could be developed through a wide variety of venues, including campus-wide conversations and focus groups, fireside chats with students, local community leaders and faculty on intriguing research topics of mutual and local interest, employer and other stakeholder surveys, interviews and forums.

B. **Topic Two: Identifying “Niches of Notice”**

It is the observation of the visiting team that CMU has yet to define for itself the meaning and substance of the concept of “national prominence” and how that concept might in turn develop new contexts for scholarship within the institution. The team recommends that CMU identify and develop “niches of notice” by which we mean existing or potential areas of academic and support strengths that directly relate to the new vision and project clear and identifiable internal and external constituencies. These new constituencies will provide contexts that make possible incremental and sustainable growth and result in verification of success against select indicators (see (3) below) at some national level. In the President’s annual report to the Board, he described just this thrust: “My assessment following my first year of service was that CMU has succeeded in building strong academic program niches with services that are unmatched.”

Building on the President’s recognition in 2002, the team suggests that CMU consider making an inventory of CMU’s existing research and scholarly strengths (including curricular and co-curricular strengths), namely its niches of excellence, with a view to identifying what it considers internal best practices in programs, such as the Honors Program, programs in Psychology, Beaver Island Biological Station, Faculty Insight Teams, Student Research and Creative Endeavors Exhibition and the public display of student work at the state capitol to name a few. This inventory then could be better publicized to increase student-faculty scholarship. This inventory may also yield opportunities for development that include:

- creating new inquiry-based courses in a range of disciplines (in which students are asked to develop their own research questions and investigate them);
- creating disciplinary and interdisciplinary research methods courses that promote original student research;
- designing courses or workshops that occur before and after students engage in internships, volunteer work or study abroad programs and that prompt them to conduct research during the experience, revise the research, and reflect on learning after the experience;
- establishing a summer undergraduate research program;
- including oral student presentations as well as the creation of published proceedings of the Student Research and Creative Endeavors Exhibition;
- developing a Student Information Database akin to the existing Faculty Information Database.

To strengthen the core teaching mission of CMU, faculty could be offered support and suggestions for teaching writing which promotes scholarship. The Faculty Center for Innovative Teaching established in 2004 focuses on faculty development. In 2002, the President pointed out that due to retirements and attrition “the university [was] hiring as many as 100 faculty positions at any one given time. Partially because we are hiring so many new faculty members, we invested in a faculty center for academic excellence last year. The center will focus on strengthening teaching, research, and service. As a significant part of its mission, the center’s staff will emphasize the importance of research as it enhances opportunities for active learning.
Protecting the university’s reputation for excellence in teaching was a major force behind creating the center last year.” The Center may be expanded to focus on supporting scholarship and research strategies.

Another possible approach might be to examine external societal challenges within CMU’s service region to which the University can respond according to its intellectual resources and the degree to which those resources could be coalesced in keeping with the concept of “niches of notice.” CMU has already identified several niches of excellence for further development such as the National Charter Schools Development and Performance Institute which is the only one of its kind in the nation with federal funding. The University’s public broadcasting and extended learning programs also continue to be a source of distinction on which CMU continues to build. (2002 President’s report to the Board).

Additionally, to better prepare students for scholarly inquiry, increased attention could be given to providing support for faculty to develop strategies to help students to become accomplished action-oriented or applied scholars and researchers. To illustrate, Science and Technology faculty have historically involved students in their research in meaningful ways. Humanities, fine arts, social science and other faculty could use similar strategies (e.g., developing focused questions, teaching students key research methods and techniques, and assisting them with analyzing data) to include students in their work. Thus the University could consider a two-pronged approach in seeking national prominence: (1) that it invest a measurable amount of resources targeted to promote research and scholarship at the front end to provide more visibility not only to its existing niches of strength but also to attract faculty research interest in emerging scholarly areas if that model resonates with the CMU community; and (2) that it target another measurable amount of resources to strengthen existing faculty-student initiatives in scholarship and research, reflecting the Boyer model if that is the model the University community broadly supports.

C. Topic Three: Identifying Indicators of Distinction

Assuming agreement on the “niches of notice” and ways in which they could be made more visible, the team suggests that CMU develop a baseline set of indicators of distinction. The following list is meant to be illustrative only, not exhaustive in scope:

- Benchmarking niche programs against similar programs not only at peer competitors but also at “aspirant” institutions. For instance, CMU could set a goal of exceeding national benchmarks on measures of undergraduate student satisfaction and achievement in the variety and quality of student-faculty research engagement.
- Succeeding at attracting and hiring new faculty who are the first choice of departments.
- Implementing a faculty reward structure in accordance with the principle of “parity of esteem” for scholarly work in research, creative activity, and teaching.
- Increasing interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary initiatives in undergraduate and graduate programs as specified in the President’s 2005-06 goals statement and Priority I, Strategy 2 of CMU 2010. Neuroscience in CMU’s Brain Center is one of many examples of interdisciplinary initiatives currently undertaken at CMU that show promise as emerging “niches of notice.”
• Attracting more McNair scholars to graduate programs. It may be that CMU’s reputation of excellence in basic and applied research could be of interest to these high performing and select students.

• Using ongoing and effective program review and assessment practices to ask key questions that require better return on investment in programs that fall short of unit and CMU expectations.

• Seeking programmatic accreditation where appropriate. Such peer assessments validate a department’s confidence in the quality of a program.

• Meeting or exceeding national standards of excellence (e.g., becoming involved in the Michigan Quality Award). Application to the state Quality Award could reveal more ways to showcase that CMU’s internal processes are positioned to ensure quality in its educational and organizational outcomes.

• Increasing the number of partnerships that asserts CMU’s leadership in serving as a statewide voice in education. For instance, the Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs has succeeded in securing state funding for the CMU’s Natural Resources Center and in the area of Neuroscience research. Thus, CMU is at the table in discussions at the state government and the state legislature. Cultivating its presence and influence with these state and federal bodies is a step in the right direction. The teams in the Office of Government Relations and in Research and Sponsored Programs have seen highly desirable increases in external funding, but dollars are far from the only measure of success for a university. All faculty and student recognitions, publications, honors and awards are relevant but the mix varies markedly from discipline to discipline. The true test of scholarship is peer evaluation using appropriate measures. It is important that faculty excel with respect to their peers.

• Increasing the number of submissions for sponsored research, instruction, creative works, and service recognizing that opportunities for external funding vary significantly among disciplines. For instance, the team sees CMU’s success with Charter Schools to be an excellent opportunity to seek external funding for designing a rubric for evaluating Charter Schools in the state and beyond.

• Engaging professional/external advisory groups and/or organizations in identifying distinctive outcomes related to the vision (e.g., percentage goals relative to professional employment, increases in external funding and publications, increases in requests for external consulting). Such external validation endorses the success of campus initiatives while providing rich opportunities that the campus may elect to pursue or not.

D. Topic Four: Leveraging Institutional Investments to Reach Prominence

Assuming the establishment of baseline indicators of distinction, the team suggests that CMU engage in an incremental and carefully planned approach to leveraging institutional investments in identified niche areas. In the collective experience of the team, institutions making successful transitions such as that being considered by CMU increase their investment in the library, information technology, competitive internally funded research for both faculty and students, and the redistribution of research overhead (indirect costs) to provide the best incentives for new scholarship. For instance, CMU’s Information Technology unit has managed well to date, but
challenges lie ahead. Among those are migrating to a new Student Information System, developing a data warehouse for planning and reporting, increased research infrastructure, administrative and fiscal functions, and course management scalable usage to name a few. As greater demands in the University increase for all of the identified functions, new uses continue to emerge. It is essential that Information Technology be engaged in the central planning and funding discussions of the University. New threats to the technology infrastructure challenge even the best positioned organizations and missteps can be extremely costly to the functioning and reputation of a university.

Furthermore, successful institutions find ways to leverage such focused decisions to enhance related programs that may not be directly involved but are either necessary for institutional success or may be beneficiaries of niche success. Such leveraging includes new federal funding, increased corporate funding, state and federal earmark funding, and other funding partners. The team wants to be clear that the enhancement of certain programs need not come at the expense of other programs of excellence.

CMU has an organizational structure with very strong faculty participation and an unusual degree of self-determination at the unit/department level. This has obvious benefits but may present obstacles when a major shift in direction is proposed for the whole University. The conduits and opportunities related to achieving increased scholarship and national prominence will result in changes in reward structures and financial growth. It is always advisable for a university to match its reward structure to the goals it values most.

The team observes that resource allocation across multiple internal constituencies is something CMU needs to consider carefully, as addressed in the main report. This complements the new institutional priority at CMU to enhance the infrastructure for research and creative activity. At present, it seems that a new graduate program may only be able to arise within a College that recognizes a niche and has the resources to support a new program. The President is to be commended for having provided increased internal funding opportunities to encourage researchers and a research culture. These funds are particularly noteworthy in tight budget times; for example, the President’s Research Investment Fund grants up to $25,000 for two years to support research with the goal for submission of a major proposal to an external funding agency. We also commend the Faculty Research and Creative Endeavors program, Research Excellence Funds, the Grant Development Reimbursement Award and the Faculty Insight Team each with a special purpose that matches the CMU stated objectives.

Some common broad-based resources needed are in research compliance and grant-writing support (similar to that now provided through the Development office), marketing and enrollment management planning and execution, library resources (including personnel to assist student and faculty researchers), and information technology (including personnel to support users and administrative functions). The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, especially, has a surprisingly lean staff.
even with the new staff additions in 2005 and will need to choose the direction in which it grows to support the niches of notice. The administrative side of a research office is required to fulfill federal mandates for the responsible conduct of research. These include grants management, institutional biosafety, human subjects (IRB) and use of animals in research as well as conflict of interest and other such items. Thus, the staffing and funding for this area needs consideration in the new thrust for research and scholarship.

There appears to be little or no infrastructure to support core facilities, or provide matching grants or major instrumentation. Again, this may be essential for a particular niche, or may be less important in others. One of the key ingredients necessary to reach national prominence is to ensure that the appropriate level of institutional investment is made in physical plant assets, financial resources and human capital. CMU has done a good job on each of these fronts individually, and it will be extremely important, if not paramount, that the institution coordinate the academic effort with the necessary resources in order to achieve its goals. All sectors of the university and community must be in constant communication about how to integrate these two drivers --academic/research side and the infrastructure/resource --in order to achieve prolonged success. Currently the support resides in the Colleges or units so coordination is recommended in order to maximize the success in a few key areas of inquiry. However, some fields are enormously expensive and we encourage the continuation of collaborative research with larger Michigan universities that is now occurring in certain settings.

The team recommends special attention be given to developing a forward-thinking enrollment management plan which includes new strategies and interventions for matriculating additional high-ability and scholarly students (e.g., summer seminars for gifted high school students, phone calling by CMU faculty to National Merit and other high-achieving students, showcasing of Centralis Scholars and Alumni at open houses and other major recruitment events). It is indeed possible to share commitment to undergraduate programs and promote faculty involvement with students at all levels when the focus moves to scholarship, research, and creative activity. Attracting more high ability students will foster enhanced learning and scholarship for all members of the CMU community.

E. Topic Five: Determining Progress Steps

The combination of baseline indicators and identified leverage opportunities provides the impetus for determining a timeline for action, creating a plan for assessing progress, modifying the plan as necessary, and identifying key indicators of success. A hypothetical example follows:

_Huron State University has engaged in varied and numerous university-wide conversations and reached widespread agreement on "community-based research" as its point of focus. HSU's service region includes a regional medical center that has recently undertaken a "Healthy Community Initiative." The service region is reasonably diverse and includes an identified Native American population. Huron_
Regional Medical Center has been frustrated by the lack of progress of this initiative over its first two years. The Center has seen no decline in the number of emergency room patients, no increase in vaccinations, and an increase in alcohol-related medical problems. HSU has approached the dean of Health Professions for assistance with developing a better awareness campaign around the healthy community initiative in order to achieve more positive results.

Because HSU has already identified community-based research as its focus, the dean of Health Professions asks the provost to assist in convening the Council of Deans to craft an interdisciplinary response to this request for assistance. As a result, the deans of Health Professions, Communication and Fine Arts, Business, and Arts & Sciences and director of Multicultural Affairs create a strategic initiative based on the following strengths: clinical health programs, broadcasting, marketing, biological sciences, and multicultural programming. With faculty assistance, students from nursing, marketing, cultural anthropology, and broadcasting create a media-based information and awareness campaign designed to increase the number of citizens engaged with the healthy community initiative. These same students create a plan for establishing an existing baseline, assessing multiple methods of engagement using multiple measures, and providing both institutions with the results. The students receive $10,000 from the Provost's Office for the research component of this service activity. The dean of Health Professions and the executive director of the Huron Regional Medical Center apply for funding from National Institutes of Health through their rural services initiative. The result is a three-year, $200,000 grant to support salaries, materials and supplies, travel and training. Research overhead dollars are then used to fund a one-course release for two semesters for a professor in the Department of Biology to create a new section of Biology 101 (general education) infused with the theme of community health which includes an experiential learning component consistent with HSU's existing requirement for such action-based research experiences wherever possible.

CMU 2010 forms an excellent starting point for enacting a new, shared vision of scholarship at CMU. Once a shared definition of national prominence for CMU is developed, key stakeholders should work collaboratively to create a plan to increase research and scholarship and strengthen student-faculty research that includes a three-to-five-year timeline, clear outcomes for each year and a plan for aligning resources to meet the plan's outcomes. Such a plan should complement CMU 2010 or may be an updated section of the dynamic CMU 2010. Key questions that CMU must address in creating such a plan or update would be:

- Where will the authority and responsibility reside for the design and implementation of the plan?
- Which initiatives will reside centrally and which will be decentralized to the departments?
- Does CMU have the technological infrastructure to support the plan?
- How will the effectiveness of the plan be evaluated and modified as a part of broader, ongoing University assessment practices and decision-making?
The team believes strongly that CMU is on the right track. CMU’s faculty, staff, administration, and students care deeply about their University. Communication channels have been opened up with the commitment, dedication, and intensity with which the Special Emphasis chapter in the self-study was prepared. The team trusts that continued discourse will lead to solutions that are right for CMU and provides a good return on investment.

III. RECOGNITION OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS, PROGRESS, AND/OR PRACTICES

CMU Mission statement states, “Through its partnerships and outreach efforts, the university promotes learning outside the traditional classroom and enhances the general welfare of society.” ProfEd is the vehicle through which a significant component of educational outreach is accomplished. ProfEd (Professional Education) is the new name of what was formerly known as the College of Extended Learning. The name change parallels CMU’s recognition of the changing environment in higher education that requires a more flexible response to external constituencies. The name change was accompanied by a restructuring of the outreach unit that included organizational and personnel restructuring to increase organizational and staff efficiencies dedicated to serving a broad array of programs delivered on site at multiple national and international locations. ProfEd is also charged with developing new business models and partnerships that provide quality, fiscally sound, and responsive to market programming to adult learners. Currently 90% of ProfEd’s program delivery is face-to-face. The Vice President/Executive Director does anticipate growth in online and blended program delivery. To facilitate this growth, ProfEd employs an instructional designer and multimedia staff who are located adjacent to the FaCIT group.

To allow greater flexibility to Colleges and better define ProfEd services, a Ventures Program process has been proposed. At the time of the visit, while several Venture Programs are in process, none have been implemented. The outcomes from these changes have yet to be fully realized, but the Six Month Review of ProfEd indicates that this unit is implementing substantial changes and monitoring the impact of those changes in a responsible manner. There is evidence that ProfEd is engaged in assessing trends in educational needs through participation in national marketing subscription services and partnerships. In addition, off-campus students are regularly surveyed and Program Coordinators conduct academic program assessments that are integrated into planning and communicated with departments. While nearly 50% of ProfEd’s enrollments are a result of military personnel and military related personages, deployment and base closings pose a considerable threat to this level of academic engagement. To this end, ProfEd has hired an administrator to monitor and advise the organization on educational needs and trends of the military.

Public Broadcasting
CMU operates one of the few remaining public broadcasting stations connected to a higher education institution in the country. The station is a significant contributor in the positive image and outreach role of CMU. Approximately 25% of it funding comes from
CMU; 25% from federal or corporate sponsorships; and 50% is raised through regional and private giving. The radio and television station has a broad service area, covering 2.5 million residents throughout Michigan and into Canada. In recent years, CMU has capitalized upon this media opportunity through local programming, visiting speakers and state and national politicians. As WCMU upgrades to an enhanced digital spectrum, CMU should utilize the multiple frequencies to provide increased educational programming throughout the viewing public. The funding support from CMU has the potential to be recouped three-fold by the opportunities for outreach programming, service and community engagement.

Information Technology
The Office of Information Technology provides infrastructure support for network and computing for CMU. This includes Network Services, Administrative Services, Advanced Technologies, Information Services, and IT Projects and Operations. This is a broad range of responsibilities that encompasses extensive enabling functions of a university environment. Information Technologies touches nearly every aspect of the university environment and provides the basic framework as well as competitive advantages for higher learning. As higher education develops a greater dependency on computing systems, it impacts the ability of the university to accomplish its strategic goals.

Government Relations and Public Affairs
The Vice President's team has been notably successful in securing funding for the Center for Nanotechnology as well as the $250,000 state grant for work on disability services and for research in neuroscience. Moreover, the team has been successful in raising CMU's profile with the state government and the state legislature. Thus, CMU is included in policy discussions about higher education in Michigan and in discussions about funding. The Vice President's team is to be commended for recent accomplishments.

Charter Schools
CMU is the nation's leading university authorizer of charter schools (self-study, 209) and has successfully issued charter contracts to 57 (of 216) charter schools in Michigan. Its involvement with its constituents in the area of Charter schools is to be commended. The University's participation in this area holds great potential for expanded scholarship and research.