A comment consistently expressed at previous sessions is that our goals seem to be more operational than strategic. Some are strategic while others express what we are going to do anyway. As a result, participants have recommend things that might be more strategic or thematic in terms of the directions we might want to go in the next five years. We have a set of six goals. Some have objectives and others do not. The goals are broader and the objectives are more specific (how to operationalize the goals).

GOAL #1

• The Stockton Center appears to be an afterthought. How well are we serving students in San Joaquin County? Although we have a campus in Stockton, the University does not have a major presence in San Joaquin County. A number of other universities have more of a presence, such as National University. We need to recognize in our strategic planning that we have two campuses – one in Turlock and one in Stockton. San Joaquin County is our largest market of the six-counties that we serve and we are under-serving San Joaquin County. As an example, last year, 2,000 teachers were trained in San Joaquin County. Stanislaus probably trained 200 of those. Most of the people trained last year were trained by the San Joaquin County Office of Education. People working in the SJCOE have stated, in writing, that if they were an institution of higher education they would be the leading producer of teachers in San Joaquin County. The freeway signs also are misleading (e.g., Stan State next exit, Multi-Campus Center). It’s California State University, Stanislaus-Stockton campus.

In Education, we are barely meeting, at this point in time, 80% of our enrollment target and yet we’re turning students away. Hopefully, in the strategic plan there will be a call for a more equitable level of services at the Stockton campus over the next five years, so that we can not only serve the students we currently have, but also serve a higher number of students throughout San Joaquin County.

• We should address the mix of students that we want to have; do we want to change that in anyway? We should celebrate the kind of students that we have in the Valley – first generation; diverse students, not only ethnically but in age; diverse skills – and then position the University to really address it in the most aggressive way possible.

• Seven years ago there was talk in my department of building out the University’s and the department’s presence in Stockton to the point there would be a full-time person in our department in Stockton. We are not aggressively pursuing what we market up there, but we also are not dedicating resources at the Stockton Center to make it more effective.
addition to signs, we’ve got to have the resources that go to the library and staff who are there when the students are – it really comes down to how we deal with tight budgets. If we are going to do something in Stockton then we need to commit to it. If we are not going to commit to it, then we should pull out. We shouldn’t be wasting our time and wasting our students time or potential students time.

• What you are addressing is objective 3, student retention and graduation. If we are going to retain our students and programs we have to have the classes in place so that they can continue and graduate. If we are not fulfilling our obligation to them in terms of having those classes and having that presence, then it’s going to impact objective #3.

• I don’t want to be telling students they can complete a master’s degree in three years, when actually it may be longer than that because classes aren’t offered in Stockton to complete their master’s degree. I never told them, when I was recruiting, you might have to take a semester off because the courses won’t be offered up here.

• Right now, the 80% of enrollment target is pretty consistent in Stockton also. Although the classes are full and the waiting lists are full, it hasn’t actually tripped over that line yet, this semester, but it’s very close. With the reduction in students it’s something to be watched. I think it’s significant that the classes are as full as they are and the waiting list is full even with our reduction in enrollment.

• Are we in or are we out? For example, the year before last we were asked to hold the line on enrollments, so we did. Then the University of the Pacific came in and took at least 20 of the students that we wouldn’t take. Sac State came down to Lodi and took another 20 that we wouldn’t serve. That sets a trend for other universities to come in, because we are playing a minimal role in serving the people of San Joaquin County.

• A complaint I hear is that it is impossible to complete a degree program here. One benchmark of how we are doing is, can a student actually go to school in Stockton and get their degree.

• As we look forward, we need to identify programs for growth and invest in them. If we want Stockton to be 20% of the student body, or 30% of the student body, that is what you plan and you put in the necessary resources. In some ways it might even stand-alone. It can stand on its own as a major strategic initiative, or it can be a part of the overall enrollment. Even if its part of it, it needs to be something definitive; more than we are just going to increase the services to Stockton.

GOAL #2

• The second goal does not say anything about Stockton either. If we are going to expand, it will take an investment in the facilities and this doesn’t speak to that issue.

• Stockton is a unique campus and does have some very special things to offer, including a computer lab. It will include an elementary school and high school that presumably will provide training and service opportunities for our Education students.
• Classroom space has always been a problem. There should be some formal plan for expansion of the classroom.

• Goal #2 is attempting to get at the master plan part. If you are going to build out to a certain headcount, then you’ve got to plan the instructional space – how much, what kind, and all of those elements. We would need objectives underneath that item. Some have suggested that this is an objective and not the goal. The goal is to have the highest quality facilities on campus that facilitate teaching and learning, and then the master plan, space utilization, etc., would be the elements that you would use to work toward that goal.

• We have so many classrooms, but the system is not doing the allocation properly. We need the sophisticated software that would allow the allocation of space to run smoother.

GOAL #3

• Objective 1 – it concerns me that we have focused in on two areas. Is that going to be where all of our energies are going to go in the next five years? What happens to the other programs? Do we want to get that specific in this objective in targeting two programs and not being open to other possibilities and other things if the market changes? Four years ago we could have written Education as a never ending job market and then all of a sudden it came to a halt. If you read some of the reports coming out, it’s going to be the never-ending job market again. So, do we want to lock ourselves in to two specific areas?

• Health care is bigger than the nursing program. It includes medical, pathology, Gerontology – Allied Health Care.

• How did you anticipate demand in 2010? — It came from planning documents, data and analyses about trends in employment, both at the federal as well as regional level. Analyzed where the growth market was, at least from a career perspective, and what that would portend for us in terms of the University to prepare people for that kind of climate. These were two that seemed to be growing strong and continuing. A challenge we have with strategic planning committees is the frustration of trying to be strategic and coming out with something that is going to move us forward as a university. But you tend to get pulled back because people say, but what about sociology, what about biology, what about Education, and pretty soon our whole list is every program. This was an attempt to say that the University is going to be strategic and look at this demand: where are the fields? I don’t believe the intent was to be exclusive of other programs and investments but, if we these areas stay on the list, then this is where we are going to look for new program development and new faculty, and attempt to target what is going to be needed to address the future as opposed to where we are now. It doesn’t mean that we diminish what we have now.

• You can’t have a strategic plan that’s not strategic. If you really want to be strategic you need to make some decisions and not everybody’s issue is going to be on the list. If you are strategic you are going to focus and really concentrate on these particular items, at least during this particular time.
• In previous discussions, somebody suggested putting “such as” in there, but that pulls it back again. “Such as” is not making a commitment to new program development in these areas.

• When presented to faculty and other groups for consideration, will we be able to see the supportive research that gave rise to these two recommendations or proposals for these two areas? — Yes (environmental scans, SWOT analysis, work force alliance data, employment data, and career growth data).

• I would almost disagree with information technology, because we are not attracting those jobs here. Most of our students are local and they stay local. Are we training them in an area where there won’t be any jobs in the Valley? Unless we assume they are all going to commute to the Bay area. Even then, that’s been in a recession mode for quite awhile.

• Eighty-percent of our students are from this area and 80% of our students stay here for their careers. We are remiss if we have not helped them understand the issues of living in this Valley (air, water, land use policy issues). Whether it’s a new GE program or some majors, I think it is a very important element where we could really distinguish our academic programs. Our graduates would become stewards of the Valley. We should also train our teachers to teach their students about relations in the Valley.

• You talk as if you are dealing with people that are just from Turlock, or the Valley, and you expect only to get those kinds of students. I’m not from here. And, I will say that no one from my hometown knows of Stanislaus. Part of my goal, as a student and as part of ASI, is that I want people to know about Stanislaus and I want people to be proud that they go to Stanislaus. What if, when you reach 10,000, the percentage of Valley students is more like 70/30? When you talk about teaching Valley needs, don’t we want to look broader and say you want people from different diverse angles and other areas? Or, are we saying because this is how it is now? In five years, how are we going to adjust if we do change, or if we don’t? I would hope for that change.

• It also depends on how you want to use your resources. If you want more people coming from the outside, you need housing and that’s a different investment. Then there would be an investment in transition programs to help students that are not from the Valley.

• The strategic plan needs to address this issue right up front. You are making a commitment to primarily serve a region, but if you want to go statewide or national that sets up a whole different set of expectations. Objective 1 is referring to statewide, but it’s not explicitly stated. The goal is the distinctiveness of the University, but I don’t think we’ve come to grips with that issue.

• I’m hearing that we need to respond both to local and statewide demand by targeting programs that support activities in health care, information technology, and other areas. But a survival technique and marketing tool for many universities now is distance learning. I think that’s probably going to be one way that we can continue to meet some of these goals, yet I don’t see that it’s mentioned anywhere in here. On-line courses, more
Blackboards, extended education, those sorts of things. Because those are meeting local and statewide needs.

- I think it’s going to happen, because there is no place to put the classes. Not many more buildings will be built, or housing to house students, so we need to think of more creative ways to deliver a program. That also means the space to place part of your classes on-line or use another technology.

- It costs less to put a Web-based class together. — Does it? In terms of infrastructure through OIT, we don’t have the resources there. The cheapest instructional mode by far is to stick one person in front of 60 people; much cheaper than an on-line course. An on-line course section also costs more than instructional television. Plus, you are talking about faculty support to get up and running with that technology. And we [faculty] are going to want to be paid well for it, because we are also going to have questions about who owns the course, who will design it for the university; so all sorts of issues are tied in to this. If you are going to do it well, it’s going to be very costly.

- If this University really went the direction that Web-based classes would be a primary emphasis, there would probably be considerations by faculty as to whether this is still the institution they want to teach at. Many faculty are here because they are interested in the face-to-face interaction with students you don’t get on-line. There is going to be another group who would be interested in that particular mode, so I think you would have a shift.

- You are in this competition where technology is leading everything that we do. So, if you are competing with other universities, you need other options for students if they can’t get into the class or are wait listed (e.g., they can do it on-line instead; or, if they are taking one class in Stockton but can’t get to Turlock for the other class, there is an option on-line). That gives them another resource, instead of going to Sac State or UoP. You are dealing with all the competition and, if we had that one edge, I think that might, in five years, give us something else that our University can offer.

- What does #3 actually mean--the banner, University of Choice? What exactly is the distinctiveness of our academic, co-curricular programs, at least in terms of public perception, or maybe even student and faculty perception? If we are going to raise awareness and appreciation of what it is this campus does for the community, part of what it does for the community is related to this distinctiveness. When we say we are the University of choice, what does that mean?

- One of the major reasons this University was established in 1960 was to prepare teachers, administrators, counselors, so forth, for the schools in the six-counties that we serve. I believe that is still one of the major reasons for our existence. The Liberal Studies program, credential program, Teacher Education, are probably the largest--30% of the students. It’s getting to a point where professional growth for these former students who have become teachers and counselors goes beyond even the masters degree to advance their careers. That is something that I believe this University should pursue-- doctoral programs, not only in the area of education but other areas as well.
• Education doesn’t even get mentioned in the objective, even though it is 30% of the students. I believe we are going to continue to be a teachers school for a long time—teacher preparation programs.

GOAL #4

• What does it mean to be full engaged? Doesn’t that go without saying? Why do we even have to make that a major goal? — It’s really because of the global part.

• I have a real problem with that one and would like to see it thrown out. We should address needs that are specific to the Valley before we go beyond. Let’s look at the needs of our six-county service area and address those first. Then look at the global issue, if we still have resources—we need to set priorities. We are not able to address the needs within our own six-county service area. Stockton is a primary example. This global thing does nothing for my students.

• I believe it really means understanding the world, not going out in to the world. If you study the Valley you will study the world, because our whole economy is very international. We are very much an export economy. From what I understand, that is not sending our students out to do a mandatory year abroad, but it is helping students to develop an understanding of global issues.

• Nowadays, you better understand umpteenth number of cultures if you are going to be a successful teacher. If you are a farmer, you better know about global markets, because you’re not selling in Turlock anymore, or in the Central Valley, you are selling in Asia and everywhere else. I think what this is getting at is that we have to stop being so parochial and so small-minded and really realize that we are in a global economy, and we are in a multi-cultural world, and we better prepare our students for that.

• To me, it’s something you should take for granted; something we do in our roles as educators.

• I am not sure that we pay enough attention in our courses to the global context of education and the global context of the economy that the students are going to be a part of. I would almost like to see the word “and” taken out of there. “Responsible global citizens.” Plus, I want to emphasize that part of being a citizen who is a “metropolitan-ite” of the globe, is that you have to be responsible for your role in global economic and political actions. If that’s what we mean by that, then cool. Otherwise, it needs to be operationalized to explain what it means.

• We have several students here--do you feel that the global issues are dealt with in your classes? — Never. Maybe in history classes, where you are reading about it, but in all classes, no--I’m a Liberal Studies major.

• How would you measure this? Is it in terms of full-time employment, in terms of volunteerism, in terms of civic involvement? Once you decide how you are going to measure it, so that you have it somewhat defined, then you can pin it down a little more.
The language is a bit awkward—maybe the objection is to this global citizen thing. Maybe what we are really talking about is preparing people to work in, to participate in a global economy and global politics. — There is a group on campus working on globalizing the curriculum, called “Global Learning for All.” They have come up with four themes: sustainability; interdependence; perspective consciousness; and one other.

GOAL #5

• Accreditation seems to be more operational; we are mixing operational with strategic.

• It’s an assessment measure.

GOAL #6

• Recommend putting the objectives in reverse order. It sounds like we are only going to do this to raise money; empty their pockets. I think the goal is to build the awareness, the appreciation of what a campus brings to any city, county, or region. Once we do that, the money flows naturally. Instead of saying we are doing this to raise money, we should say we are doing it because people need to be aware that it is a wealth to this community to have a campus.

• It bothers me to even have an articulated objective to raise a certain amount of money. It is okay to have that objective, but without articulating it. I don’t think that’s our primary emphasis, so I don’t think we should even appear as though it is. If we achieve our other objectives and perform well then the money should follow. I don’t think that is the primary reason that we want to establish mutually beneficial relationships with our constituents.

MISSION, VISION AND VALUES STATEMENTS

• The mission starts with, interaction and partnerships with surrounding communities and provide opportunities for, and yet, when we look at goal #6, establish strong, mutually beneficial relationships, our objective is that you are going to get to know how good we are for you. I think we need another objective that goes in reverse. How can we identify the resources in the community that can enrich our educational programs, so it’s a two-way street; a give and take. We are telling them how good we are for them, but we are also taking from them what they need, what they can provide, and how they can enrich our educational programs.

• I like the last bullet about the university values.

• Does the vision statement really set the bar for what these goals are supposed to achieve? Would it help you or make you interact differently in your classes or elsewhere?

• I think it further commits me to what we should be about. It’s about students and our total focus should be on students in terms of doing the kinds of things that are addressed in this vision statement — aspire, knowledge, further develop people as moral, ethical, responsible citizens. Absolutely.
• The mission statement starts off with faculty, staff, administrators and students, but then goes to the vision statement and we hear everybody’s voice except for the students. We hear talk about the students--we inspire students to demand more of self than they do of others, attain new knowledge and challenge assumptions--nowhere do we hear the students voice.

• When new programs are developed, or older programs are revised or modified, it appears to me that we rarely ask current and former students for input. I believe it’s really important to use their expertise, their experiences in programs, to help build new programs and help make current programs better. At least once a year, my colleagues and I conduct focus groups throughout the six-counties. We meet with people who hire our students and find out directly from them, what do you want us to do, what are we doing well, what are things we should be doing better, and what are things we are not doing that we should be doing. I don’t see a lot of that happening.

• Maybe ASI could draft something that says, we as students seek out intellectual challenge, the attainment of new knowledge, something along those lines.

• Do we need a goal on assessment? Assessing how well we are doing? Do we have a method to assess whether our programs make any difference to our students? Do we have any way of determining how good we are, or are not?

• In my view, its the methodology that helps us understand the acquisition or the commitments that we made, our goals and our objectives, but not a specific objective. It isn’t our ultimate goal--so we can better achieve the goals that we have and have better quality of what we do. I worry about it, if it became a standalone issue.

• I agree, but I think first you have to develop and implement the system. When you have that system in place, and it’s a good system, then it’s no longer a goal. It’s set, because now you are getting the feedback and it’s informing all the other goals. I think when you are starting off, and you need to develop a system, by putting it as a goal it portends a focus of something you need to achieve.

• Some universities see that as their strategic niche. They are known as the university you go to in order to look at quality, fostering student learning, and the assessment of student learning. And faculty has scholarships in those areas. It would have to elevate to that level in my mind to hit the list.

• Think about what it would mean to actually assess whether we are reaching our goals. With respect to something like goal 4, is it so that none of our students end up in some sort of international finance scandal and, therefore, we know that we’ve done number 4? Assessment of what, is the question I have. Assessment of outcomes for the students? I’m not sure that necessarily means we’ve done our jobs well. I think it’s a weird problem of trying to figure out whether what you’ve done well can be assessed in terms of outcomes that are quantifiable.