Introduction and Overview by June Boffman

Goals 1 & 2

- We should be going to politicians and seeking more funding.
- What is “partnering” with regional schools? What are the specifics on these programs?
  - Some programs are sponsored by the Chancellor’s Office, preparing K-12 students for CSUS or higher education in general.
  - Because local graduates are a lower percentage than they could be. For example, only a small percentage of the high school students are “qualified” to go to CSUS and a small percentage of those who qualify are actually attending. “Partnering” is geared to help “qualify” more students and get them here or on track to higher education.
  - What is the most effective in partnering? What measures are working the best to accomplish these goals? Do we need new ideas or just more energy to what we are already doing?

- Focus: Student access:
  - We don’t really know or have an answer at this point. Many students just traditionally start at the local community colleges. The new superintendent of Merced schools is very eager to work harder and strengthen the programs.

- Goals 1 & 2 should be drawing most of our attention (not solely, but priority focus). Are these goals on track?

- Focus: Stockton in relation to Goal 1
  - How do people view the Stockton Center and the growth/potential there?
  - Rumors are that the resources aren’t there, that we don’t have the resources to put into it. Are we losing out on Turlock campus because of the Stockton campus?
  - Highly unlikely that students would drive to Turlock if Stockton campus is gone. It’s also very hard on faculty to split between both campuses. There is a need for resident faculty. Students feel like it’s a distance-learning college because they rarely get to connect with a “live” faculty person.
  - There are exciting new developments happening in Stockton in the near future, which will boost all areas of the campus.
Perhaps we need to decide which programs in Stockton need to remain and really focus on developing those few programs rather than spreading resources thin and trying to cover too many areas.

Students don’t like having to drive to Stockton from Turlock or vice versa to take classes.

Focus: Objectives under Goal 1:
- We need better classroom utilization. Larger classrooms?
- We’ll need more faculty and staff to accommodate the growth as described in the vision and goals. Is it just presumed that we’ll accommodate and that’s why it’s not specifically listed under the objectives?
- We need a vision of WHY we need more money when pitching/lobbying for more money to politicians, or anyone. We need to be specific and list reasons why the money is needed, where it is going.

Focus: Faculty and class size
- Traditionally we think a small class is good (faculty in the classroom instead of grad assistants). What is the correct/right balance with faculty in class versus scholarship/research?
- Do we want to maintain an 80:20 ratio of tenure track to part-time faculty?
- Do we want to maintain or reduce our SFR, if so can we meet our goal to change faculty workload?
- We don’t have the infrastructure to bring people here other than for teaching. But it IS important that we have the research and field knowledge in our teaching.
- Diversity is the key in this area. The goals and objectives should be cultivation and autonomy with faculty and departments.

Focus: Student retention and graduation
- Regarding getting students through college in four years: the class schedule needs to be more flexible in order to satisfy the demand and see improvement in retention rates. A big piece is tracking the demand and mapping out the scheduling. Is 4 years realistic for a student working their way through college? Should students be paying per credit instead of per semester since they don’t/can’t take more than 9 units?
- Should we be encouraging students to take out loans so they can get through college faster and make better money than working low paying jobs while attending school?