
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS
FROM: PENNY ROSE
SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY 10/31/03
DATE: MARCH 2, 2004

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Jean Scott. Ten members: Bryant, Craig, Catalano, Freeman, Koester, Lazorik, Radford, Scott, Steinhagen, and Vickers were in attendance. Scott distributed the agenda. She also asked that the committee review the draft she e-mailed to each of them regarding the records office and the office of student financial aid response to their administrative unit review, and return to her by the end of the day on November 5, 2003.

The first item of review was the strategic plan update. A plan of action is needed to continue the strategic plan. Scott asked for ideas not in the current documents, comments or criticisms. The following ideas were mentioned in brainstorming session, with the understanding that some may be adopted, some may not be, and that the ramifications of each would required careful investigation.

1. More attention to the liberal arts. Strengthen liberal arts in interdisciplinary aspect.
2. Avoid hills of distinction (signature programs without enough funding and accountability to make them truly outstanding)
3. Signature programs need: a) focus, b) ongoing review
4. Resources for rich co-curricular program (build taste for it) – goes hand in hand with liberal arts
5. Emphasis on quality – within the core values of the plan to build academic programs – the total student experience.
6. Civic engagement – liberal arts more than just preparation for career or personal benefit, but for the public benefit. MC as cultural center seen in the eyes of the community (related to #4, co-curricular program, bringing in speakers, etc.)
7. International presence. How do we maintain presence, student mix in light of the difficulty getting visas.
8. Implications of Gateway Program –With more local students how can we overcome sense of disengagement?
9. Honors enhancement program. Want to maintain a vibrant program.

10. Think big –Move to 1500-1600 undergraduates. a) Quality/size of applicant pool, b) “Star Faculty” (fixed or visiting) to attract students if money was available, i.e. politicians, mass media or journalism, etc. Provide deeper academic programs, more faculty, be richer in terms of diversity. How do we make MC a magnet for students? Before making decisions, seek input from 18-year-old students. What would it take to get students involved in activities? Student Senate will be involved in focus groups for strategic planning. Scott will approach.
11. 3-Year programs. Way of being more attractive to students? May not be done across the board – only certain disciplines. Would need to provide more of a robust summer program – financial aid problems? Three year programs have not become a big trend.
12. Calendar with variation of January term. More mileage out of short off-campus programs. Give international experience to students. Recruiting tool – offer 4 week on-campus, national or international experience to students. What would it take from the endowment to offer this to students? 300 students with a stipend of \$1,000, endowment of \$6M. Would excite students, enhance enrollment and retention, and entice donors.
13. Every matriculated student receive mini MacArthur grant (\$250) to do something “academically related”. By the end of “X” year produce something tangible. How do we enforce?
14. Investigative studies guarantee. Is there a MC guarantee? Every student offered a stipend for one summer to do investigative study. Stipend for faculty also.
15. How do we encourage faculty to do research in the summer? Some travel would be involved. Include science, humanities, and social science. What would enhancing quality do for levels of compensation and support?

Scott requested that each member review the vision statement, the documents she prepared, as well as the report prepared by DeWine. E-mail responses to her prior to next Friday’s meeting and she will compile a list for review.

Administrative review of the Comprehensive Campaign and Annual Fund was presented by Koester. The committee was pleased both with the results of the Campaign and with the efficiency with which it was conducted—sith a cost of 8.6cents to raise a dollar. We understand that the next campaign may need to be so effeicient, and encourage the advancement office in its efforts to continue to support donors and to help the campus identify priorities and make the case for the next campaign.

The Committee recognizes the growing difficulties in the annual fund aras, as phonathons become more difficult, and applauds the efforts of the office to reach out through cold calls and on-line contacts.

The Committee shares with the Vice President for Advancement concern about percentage and levels of alumni giving, and recognizes that staffing levels in the office may need to increase prior to another campaign.