

DRAFT

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE

March 7, 2005

SUMMARY NOTES

President Hughes commented on a concern coming out of the AASCU study team exit interview about how to preserve institutional memory regarding strategic planning. Dr. Hughes reviewed the strategic planning activities under her leadership, which began in 1994 with the first effort to revise the mission statement. Dr. Hughes pointed out that the *Pathways* document was not just a sudden piece of information that appeared. Comments from multiple groups and individuals across campus and in the community were actively sought from the very beginning.

Executive Assistant June Boffman reviewed the development of the current draft five-year goals. The original draft that set the stage was prepared in December by the Strategic Planning Core Planning (SPCPC) committee, a subgroup comprised of 3 SPSC and 3 USGPC members. The SPCPC reviewed the SWOT analysis, conducted a workshop in October that included representatives from the Foundation and University Advisory Boards, and subsequently pulled together the first set of draft goals as talking points. That draft was the focus of 11 round table sessions in January and early February, plus one separate session devoted to students. Dr. Boffman noted that 14% students, 26% faculty, 19% staff, and 41% administrators participated over time.

The draft goals resulting from the roundtable sessions were reviewed by the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee and, subsequently, by everyone who attended the President's Executive Cabinet retreat (including the Provost's Deans' Council and representatives of the Senate Executive Committee, the Associated Students, the Labor Council, Randy Harris, and Steve Hughes). Overall participation was 62% administrators, 6% staff, 21% faculty, and 10% students. From those discussions, the current draft was developed. A revised set of documents will go out for campus comment again, following today's discussion with the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. The mission, vision, values, and five-year goals will be taken to the various constituent groups as a package; administrators also will take these documents to their respective divisions/units for review. The goal is to take final action by the end of the academic year.

GOAL 1: Ensure that the higher education needs of our growing student body are met through 2010 with high quality faculty, staff, and infrastructure.

Objective 1A: Continuously exceed CSU system-wide averages and our national comparison Universities for rates of student retention and graduation.

Objective 1B: Complete a Facilities Master Plan to prepare for a full campus build-out with a 15,000-student headcount in 2020.

Objective 1C: Recruit, develop and retain excellent faculty by creating a model that addresses our commitment to flexible faculty workload and promotes teaching excellence, professional development, and service to the university and community.

Objective 1D: Recruit, develop and retain excellent staff by supporting professional development, work process innovation and service to the University.

Objective 1E: Increase opportunities for close student-faculty interaction and for campus-community engagement.

President Hughes asked if 1C implies continuous improvement in the RPT process? Dr. Boffman said the objective was aimed at remodeling faculty workload to allow some flexibility, which would promote the availability of time to do things that are important in the RPT process. Dr. Hughes suggested that continuous review and improvement of the RPT review process should be incorporated. Dr. Boffman noted it might be added as a subset of 1C.

Renaë Floyd asked whether the recommendation is to be more specific in 1C with regard to professional development? President Hughes noted that professional development is an element that makes RPT more tangible, but it needs to be a dynamic process that is discussed. Dr. Hughes said that she meets with the campuswide RPT committee at the beginning and end, but noted she is not sure what goes on in-between—there is a need to constantly react to and debrief the two cycles each year.

President Hughes recommended that 1D include staff performance reviews—accountability measurements.

Vice President Morgan-Foster asked if it would be appropriate to talk about how we identify the infrastructure needs? Do we need a separate objective that will evaluate and assess the service infrastructure? Vice President Stephens commented that the objectives are setting up what we need to think about during the next five years. If we set up a separate structure, we will end up spending the next five years identifying the processes of the infrastructure—this is something that has to be organic.

Dr. Boffman pointed out that each unit would decide what they should evaluate that contributes to these objectives. Deanie Brown commented on the potential limitation of the model, if it only addresses the physical plant (1B).

VP Morgan-Foster asked, is there room in this goal to talk about the importance of assessing the infrastructure itself, or is it implied in 1B? VP Ruud noted that it is also covered in goal #4, which talks about careers, and there are other areas that talk about some of these issues. VP Stephens said she does not see this document as setting up the process. Deanie Brown pointed out that many people will rely on this as a guide and not everyone will be able to articulate what that means. VP Ruud said there should be some allowance for individual sub-unit structures. By just stating infrastructure it allows, for example, Student Affairs to address their specific infrastructure needs. In 5A, division heads would need to be more specific with their units, but that would not be spelled out in the goal itself. Deanie Brown referred to an example from last year's discussion concerning the phrase "safe physical environment." It was changed to "safe environment" in order to clarify the goal was not limited to physical security but included emotional security.

In further discussion, VP Morgan-Foster pointed out that the primary infrastructure item is 1B. The question is, should there be a separate objective under goal 1 that talks about the importance

of continuously assessing infrastructure for the purposes of achieving a comprehensive array of infrastructure support services? For example, adding a 1F, which would focus on continuous quality improvement related to assessing the campus infrastructure—embed assessment in the identification process to assure that it happens. Dr. Boffman responded that the entire document has that purpose.

VP Stephens said she would prefer to take 1B out, noting that 1A has a lot of infrastructure embedded in it and 1B might be misinterpreted. President Hughes responded that 1B should be rephrased rather than removed, noting that the facilities master plan is never really complete. VP Stephens suggested revising 1B to read, “Complete a facilities master plan review...”. Phil Rojas expressed concern that it should be defined so that everyone understands what the term infrastructure includes. Deanie Brown noted the question being asked is, is it all encompassing or is it facilities?

VP Morgan-Foster noted that infrastructure is not addressed in the objectives in a broad way—a continuous quality improvement and assessment process or a recognized way that says we are always seeking to do goal 1. Dr. Boffman responded, if you add an objective focused on assessment then you also need to evaluate whether it was accomplished. In fact, this whole process is driving assessment. Each unit should define what it has decided is important to get to that goal. Andrew Sutherland also noted that as the definitions become more specific, then creativity by individual units would be less intense.

Regarding 1A, VP Stephens asked how we would “exceed” CSU systemwide averages and national comparison rates?

Phil Rojas pointed out that under 1D professional development is really directed toward staff, but a key element is managerial development. Deanie Brown noted that the term “staff” was intended to be an all-encompassing term. President Hughes said the fact that administrators are included in this objective needs to be explicitly stated.

It was suggested that the hyphen be removed from “campus-community” in 1E. As currently phrased, it is not clear that the objective is talking about campus engagement with the external community.

GOAL 2: Strengthen the preparation of CSU Stanislaus graduates to become fully engaged and responsible leaders in a global and increasingly interconnected world.

Objective 2A: Strengthen the preparation of students to understand the unique issues of our region within the context of a broader global awareness.

Objective 2B: Prepare students to act ethically in their personal and professional lives.

Objective 2C: Increase student knowledge and understanding of other societies, cultures and languages.

Objective 2D: Increase student access to experiential learning experiences through internships and service learning opportunities on campus and in our community.

In response to questions regarding General Education competencies, it was noted that this is covered under 4C, but may need to be reworded to make it clearer.

Renae Floyd suggested, under 2B, saying something about “learning to behave with personal responsibility.”

Deanie Brown suggested, under 2C, that there is an opportunity to incorporate “diversity”—faculty and staff need to become culturally competent as well. Dr. Boffman noted that this goal is focused on graduates, but acknowledged the need to add that objective under a different goal.

President Hughes suggested moving 2B to become goal 1F and include something about encouraging a campus community where faculty, staff, administrators and students act ethically...

VP Morgan-Foster suggesting removing “strengthen” from 2 and 2A—begin with “prepare” CSU Stanislaus graduates...; “prepare” students to...

GOAL 3: Develop CSU, Stanislaus-Stockton to provide eight to ten complete academic programs with the appropriate levels of academic, administrative and student support services.

Objective 3A: Increase student access and retention by offering reliable and consistent course scheduling.

Objective 3B: Ensure high quality facilities and resources for distance learning between the Turlock and Stockton campuses and throughout our broader service area.

Objective 3C: Identify and develop at least one new complete high demand program by 2006 for CSU, Stanislaus-Stockton.

Objective 3D: Develop specialized long and short-term customized programs to meet regional education needs.

Objective 3E: Develop, in collaboration with the community, a comprehensive financial plan for CSU, Stanislaus-Stockton by 2008.

VP Stephens asked whether providing 8-10 complete academic programs is realistic as a five-year goal, noting that there are significant resource and budgetary allocation decisions embedded in this—redirection of funds may be the right thing to do, but it is important that everyone understand the implications. The need to clarify the number of “complete” programs that currently exist at the Stockton Center also was noted during discussion.

VP Morgan-Foster noted that student support services are mentioned in the goal, but none are alluded to in the objectives. It was acknowledged that comprehensive services cannot be offered off site, but an appropriate level of support services should be clearly defined.

GOAL 4: Enhance the quality, distinctiveness and public image of our learning-centered University's academic and co-curricular programs.

Objective 4A: Strengthen our commitment to being a learning-centered University by engaging in a process of continuous improvement that enhances the learning experience of our students, exceeds the criteria of our accrediting agencies and that meets the needs of all our stakeholders.

Objective 4B: Target programs and support activities for growth in areas that enhance our region's economic viability.

Objective 4C: Retain and enhance our strong connection between the liberal arts and professional development to prepare our students for lifelong learning and multiple careers.

Objective 4C: Enhance and grow opportunities for faculty and student participation in contract and grant activities.

Objective 4E: Increase student preparation, connection and access by partnering with our regional schools.

Al Petrosky noted that goal 1B is explicit regarding a 15,000-student headcount, but there is nothing that talks about the intimacy of the classroom or Student Faculty Ratio in goal 4. Dr. Boffman responded the intent is to move to the measurement of class size rather than SFR as part of the measurement process. Dr. Petrosky commented that since we are being so explicit about buildings in 1B, we should say something about the intimacy of the classroom in goal 4—whether it is average class size or SFR doesn't matter.

VP Morgan-Foster noted that goal 4 is light on “co-curricular” objectives as well.

Deanie Brown also commented on the need for a “diversity” goal, noting that having a diverse student body doesn't mean our work is done. Noting that diversity is included as a value, Dr. Boffman indicated her intent to seek guidance from Deanie Brown as to the best way to incorporate diversity into the goals and objectives.

Mario Estrella noted his concurrence with the previous two concerns expressed.

President Hughes asked why 4D is limited to faculty and students. There was general consensus to revise the goal to read, “enhance and grow opportunities for increasing contracts and grants.”

VP Morgan-Foster suggested a statement about “increasing opportunities for undergraduates to engage in research.” Dr. Boffman responded that this did not come out in the round table discussions as a goal. In response to a question from Phil Rojas, Dr. Boffman said that 1E could include student research as one way to get that interaction.

GOAL 5: Raise awareness and appreciation among targeted local, regional, national and international constituencies regarding the impact of the programs, services and values of our university.

Objective 5A: Conduct a capital campaign to raise \$50 million by 2010 that will enhance our core academic mission and help to celebrate the 50th anniversary of CSU Stanislaus.

Objective 5B: Identify and develop critical public and private partnerships that serve the needs of our growing student body and campus community.

Objective 5C: Build our alumni program and increase awareness of our alumni accomplishments and contributions to society.

Objective 5D: Target programs and support activities in the Fine and Performing Arts, Athletics and other special events in order to enhance the region's cultural enrichment.

President Hughes expressed concern that goal 5 leaves the impression that we create partnerships totally for our own good, which is not the case. Partnerships are established for the good of everyone involved. Commenting that the state is the one sponsoring this, Phil Rojas asked if the statement is consistent with the mission of the CSU system? President Hughes pointed out that the CSU economic impact statement theme is "Working for California."

President Hughes said 5C is gender specific—it should be "alumni/ae" to reflect both men and women.

VISION STATEMENT (choices)

1. CSU Stanislaus strives to be the center of learning, intellectual pursuit and cultural engagement for the Central Valley of California. We will serve our students (diverse student body), community and state by creating programs, interactions, partnerships and leaders that respond to the diverse needs of an evolving and interconnected world.

2. We are a center of learning, intellectual pursuit and cultural engagement. We will serve our students, communities and state by creating programs, interactions, partnerships and leaders that respond to the diverse needs of an evolving and interconnected world.

Renae Floyd commented that goal 2 states what we are now and what we will continuously strive to be in the future.

Referencing #1, President Hughes pointed out that no other CSU campus would limit their pursuit of learning and cultural engagement to a small geographical area.

VP Morgan-Foster asked how we capture the strong sense of people caring about students? Dr. Boffman expressed her belief that it is captured in the values statement.

Mario Estrella suggested including everyone, rather than just students, in the first values statement. Dr. Boffman pointed out that it was agreed during the Cabinet Retreat to ask the students (through ASI) to add their own values statement, as noted at the end of the document.

There was general consensus to go out with several choices for the next round of campus and community feedback.

MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The faculty, staff, administrators, and students of California State University, Stanislaus are committed to ~~creating~~ a learning environment ~~which~~ *that* encourages all members of the campus community to expand ~~their~~ *our* intellectual, creative and social horizons. We challenge one another to realize our potential, to appreciate and contribute to the enrichment of our diverse community, and to develop a passion for lifelong learning.

To facilitate this mission, we promote academic excellence in the teaching and scholarly activities of our faculty, encourage personalized student learning, foster interactions and partnerships with *our local and global* ~~surrounding~~ communities, and provide opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, artistic, and *economic* enrichment of the region.

President Hughes pointed out that in the first paragraph, third line, the word “our” should be changed back to “their” to be grammatically correct.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Dr. Boffman briefly reviewed the proposed revisions to the strategic planning committee structure, which were summarized in the document as follows:

- 1) USGPC and SMPAC committees are combined as the University Strategic Goals and Measurement Committee (USGMC) with primary roles and functions of the two former committees included.
- 2) Membership is reduced to create smaller working committees.
- 3) Members of the committees are expected to consult with key players and all units on an ongoing basis.
- 4) The President is an ex-officio member of the SPSC.

The proposal includes adding WASC leadership responsibilities and assessment responsibilities into our strategic planning structures to achieve the important goals of integrating our reaccreditation efforts into normal university processes and simultaneously make the best use of university members’ time and energies.

Vice President Stephens expressed support for combining the committees, but emphasized the need to be explicit in discussions with the Academic Senate about what we are trying to achieve by reducing membership and creating smaller working committees.

Al Petrosky questioned whether the issue raised at the Cabinet retreat by Randy Harris had been resolved – that spelling out the make up of the leadership team dictates which WASC model we are choosing from among the four. Dr. Boffman responded that the combination of these

committees does not mean that the WASC leadership team has to pick the strategic planning model. WASC offers four choices: 1) strategic planning; 2) addressing every point; 3) selecting themes; and 4) the audit. Dr. Boffman noted that a really mature campus uses the audit approach to address only those things they really want to work on.

Deanie Brown noted her understanding of what is being proposed – that the WASC leadership team is really a dedicated work group, but that the leadership or “decision making” still comes through the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. The WASC leadership team is leading the discussions and working through the details, which would subsequently be brought to the SPSC

Noting that the reporting lines are fuzzy, Dr. Petrosky asked if the WASC leadership team would be subordinate to the SPSC? Dr. Boffman responded that would need to be further clarified.

VP Morgan-Foster pointed out, as we go into the accreditation process, if we have two things that appear to have no relationship to each other then it is wasted effort. Strategic planning is supposed to be setting us in a direction. How aligned is our strategic planning with our accreditation process? President Hughes noted there is a double-loop learning concept – start at point a with receiving the information, but it has to loop back up, which is critical to making this an active, functional process. Dr. Boffman noted that some continuous linkages to keep the double loop going would be required. President Hughes recommended developing a diagram that demonstrates that process, so there is no doubt about what should happen. Dr. Boffman noted that the WASC leadership team needs to know who they need to communicate with and when—it will have to be mapped out.

Dr. Boffman pointed out that there are some redundancies in the document, noting that the WASC activities have not yet been fully integrated into the strategic planning structure.

There was general consensus that the University Strategic Goals and Measurement Committee (USGMC) would assume strategic planning and WASC responsibilities, as well as measurements. The WASC leadership team would work out the details of what needs to be done for the accreditation review, but exactly how the SPSC, USGMC, and WASC leadership team will work together still needs to be worked out.

The discussion then focused on the last recommendation, which was to list the President as an ex-officio member to allow the SPSC to meet more often than the President’s schedule will permit. During the discussion, it was pointed out that the incoming president would probably want to be involved on a regular basis. It was subsequently agreed to make no changes in terms of the President’s role at this time.

It was noted that the strategic planning committees, including the SPSC, are advisory to the President, so the word “non-voting” should be removed.

STRATEGIC MEASUREMENT AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Referencing item 1.a. of the summary of recommendations, President Hughes emphasized the need to be explicit about the roles of the USGMC and the SPSC, including who will hold the campus accountable for assessment.