

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE
January 27, 2005

SUMMARY NOTES

President Hughes convened the twelfth meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on January 27, 2005. Present: Marvalene Hughes; David Dauwalder; Deanie Brown; Renae Floyd; Randall Harris; Stacey Morgan-Foster; Al Petrosky; Phillip Rojas; Bill Ruud; and Julia Fahrenbruch. Not Present: June Boffman; Mario Estrella; Steve Filling; Mary Stephens; and Drew Sutherland.

President Hughes began the discussion by noting that the University's "culture of planning" has reached a point where it is not person-dependent, which is how it should be. President Hughes then turned to Provost Dauwalder and Strategic Planning Consultant Randy Harris to lead the discussion.

REPORT ON THE 2004-2005 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Provost Dauwalder and Randy Harris reviewed the documents distributed with the agenda. A one-page summary statement, included with the implementation plan, is provided below:

Strategic Planning Implementation Plan
University Strategic Goals & Priorities Committee Report
January 2005

USGPC is forwarding the attached compilation of division and college efforts to achieve the 2004-2005 strategic goals and priorities. Information in this report was gleaned from Academic Affairs annual reports and summaries provided from each university division. Each reporting area is clearly undertaking many efforts to achieve the unit and strategic goals. The subdivisions of the strategic goals are addressed from multiple perspectives with varying degrees of concerted effort.

The current reporting process lends itself to the creation of a very inclusive list of objectives and activities addressing unit operational goals and strategic goals. From this approach, it is possible to appreciate the many efforts underway to continually improve each unit and to achieve the university strategic goals and priorities. Members agree that unit goals are as important as efforts to achieve university goals; however, mixing the two levels contributes to difficulty in selecting key indicators and measuring progress.

The committee acknowledges the concerted effort by SMPAC to identify key indicators for the 2003-2004 annual goals. The process yielded useful information but appears too complex to sustain an ongoing university-wide assessment process effectively. The complexity is increased through our current attempt to develop measures based on existing operational measures that many times do not appear to provide a clearly valid measure of the more long-run strategic goal. We also need to develop measurement and assessment processes that allow us to reflect on progress and recommend actions for continuous improvement.

The committee makes the following recommendations to complete the review of annual goals:

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE – January 27, 2005

Page 2

- 1) Do not call for a mid-year report.
- 2) Do not post the implementation summary to the Web. Members believe it does not clearly indicate primary efforts to achieve the strategic goals.
- 3) Request all divisions and units to prepare a subset of the next annual report, which specifically addresses outcome of efforts to achieve university strategic goals, reflective analysis and action plans for ongoing efforts.

Revision of the annual report process to focus on outcomes, reflection and recommendations for future action will begin a process of review consistent with long range strategic planning.

In response to questions from President Hughes, Provost Dauwalder confirmed that, rather than deferring the assessment of each of these areas, they are essentially being referred to the appropriate units. The units are expected to continue working with unit operational directions.

President Hughes expressed concern related to the administrative responsibility of the Chief Executive Officer in relation to these goals and how that is aligned with the overall strategic plan – in reviewing the performance of unit heads, a mid-year assessment of where they are within their units is important. Provost Dauwalder clarified that the intent of recommendation 1 – do not call for a mid-year report – is that individuals would not be asked to go back and write a mid-year report. The objectives and goals per individual are still there. The CEO will be able to use these as guidelines for on-going performance independent of the report. Dr. Dauwalder noted that this document takes a series of unit goals and maps them in as representing the university strategic goals.

President Hughes asked, “is this year-end report Pathways II?” Provost Dauwalder commented that the first Pathways document was a vision piece for the University that included a set of goals. Some confusion resulted when we created annual goals and we had Pathways with another set of goals. The Pathways document created the expression of the vision of this institution and the direction it planned to go. Dr. Dauwalder said, “I still see Pathways as an expression of the vision.” The goals themselves were really core values. The actual reports we are talking about are identified in our policy documents; in the support unit review documents. We made a specific request that each division create an annual report identifying the adjustments within their units (performance reports).

Randy Harris also pointed out that the process has become very complex; it is a learning process. The University attempted to move from one-year planning to more long term strategic planning. The conflicts are a result of learning and trying to bridge that gap and move from a one-year budget cycle to longer term planning. Progress has been made, but there are conflicts that have emerged as a result.

Noting that it is the responsibility of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee to recommend timelines, President Hughes said this topic would be included for further discussion at a subsequent meeting.

DRAFT FIVE-YEAR GOALS AND ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS

Commenting on the finished product and what it would look like, Randy Harris echoed the Provost's statement. He pointed out that, to date, we have provided a proposed vision statement, a set of core values, and drafted five-year strategic goals. Dr. Harris said to do this properly these separate pieces need to be integrated, which required expanding the scope of his role. All the pieces are in place for that integrated document in draft form. Dr. Harris expressed his hope that this integrated document would be the finished product, which the President calls Pathways II.

With regard to that, Dr. Harris also noted that we are currently in a bit of a flux. The various committees have met and there is a proposal to integrate two of those committees. The vision statement has gone to the Academic Senate for consideration and the Associated Students have reviewed the vision statement and made suggestions for revisions. The discussions have been far reaching, throughout the entire University.

Dr. Harris referenced one really positive consensus in that WASC acquired quite a priority. However, how to fully integrate that into our current process is still being debated. Emphasizing that WASC is not external to this process, President Hughes said that understanding what we want with WASC and the integration of the goals is critically important.

With respect to the details, Dr. Harris said two blocking points have hampered the discussions. First, the planning process on campus has been confined to silos – our unit, our programs, our resources. To move the thinking from our unit to the university as a collective community was a very big leap for most to make, but that thinking is starting to emerge. The second blocking point involves moving from annual budgetary figures to five-year long-term planning. Those two concepts have turned out to be harder to bridge than anticipated. President Hughes also commented that campuses are target driven by the system; we can specify what we want for next year's target, but five years out, the system is not there yet either.

Dr. Harris said a third sticking point has been narrowing the focus of the five-year strategic goals — people continue to ask, why don't you have my unit in here?

Provost Dauwalder noted this is a learning process that we all have to go through. We still need to clearly define what it is we are doing – the battle between individual goals and how that ties to a University direction.

President Hughes noted that if the groups involved in shaping the direction have been concerned about how to proceed, then it is our responsibility to identify how to communicate that within the system – to respond to people who are concerned about not seeing their name, their unit, their programs included. Vice President Morgan-Foster expressed her belief that it is an issue of guidance – everybody is included and what we are talking about is really a cultural shift. The key groups in helping to understand this are the department managers and department chairs.

Dr. Harris commented that the Stockton Center is a perfect example. Provost Dauwalder agreed, noting that the main question to be addressed is, what is the eventual goal or plan for the Stockton Center? Should it be a freestanding unit? Should we move to offering four-year programs, or will

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE – January 27, 2005

Page 4

Stockton always be upper division? What about 2+2 programs? Should it be tied to specific discipline areas? President Hughes said this is a situation where a different subgroup needs to be engaged in all of the alternatives just described. Dr. Hughes pointed out that the CSU Board of Trustees is discussing a new K-8 school that will be located on the Stockton site. That requires independent focused attention, particularly from Academic Affairs administration and enrollment management. There will be different issues politically, but all of this will have to be addressed forthrightly. The first is, do we offer lower division education at the Stockton Center? Also, whether there will eventually be a high school on that site

Dr. Harris commented that this is only one small piece of what we discussed in trying to get to the five-year strategic goals, which leads back to the vision statement. Maybe it would be easier to address if we had a clear and coherent concept of who we want to be as a university. A clear idea of who we want to be collectively has yet to emerge. Dr. Harris expressed his hope that we can come to some discussion about that in more focused and specific terms. President Hughes noted that this discussion addresses the differentiation goal. Dr. Harris agreed that this relates to the issues of distinctiveness and excellence. Collectively defining who we are and who we want to be down the road will serve as a branding mechanism for the university.

In response to questions about what the concerns of the Senate Executive Committee were regarding the vision statement, Speaker-elect Petrosky said it wasn't communicating the whole of the university as well as it could, noting the Associated Students had the same concern. It needs to be broader and more inclusive – focused in on the actual integration of the students and faculty.

Acknowledging that there are legitimate systemic issues that need to be addressed, Provost Dauwalder said we have to come to some decision about how to get a vision statement. Maybe it just requires a little more work. This is a huge leap we are taking and we will have bumps in the road that will require people to come back and talk about it again. Dr. Petrosky also expressed his belief that some of that conflict is really healthy. Some people are now beginning to realize that this vision statement is going to affect them somewhere down the line, where they didn't believe that before. President Hughes commented that this discussion merits a lot of time, noting that she has never seen a situation where change occurred at a pace where everybody embraced it.

In response to a question about pulling together a small group of Senators, students, and SPSC representatives to talk about ways to rewrite the vision statement to address the concerns, Dr. Harris expressed his belief that it is time to treat these pieces as an integrated document. We need to put the parts together and think of it coherently.

Dr. Harris responded affirmatively to the President's request that he lead a discussion at the Cabinet Retreat on how to integrate these documents. It was agreed that Provost Dauwalder, Randy Harris and June Boffman will schedule a planning session with Steve Hughes (the retreat facilitator) to identify the best structure for that discussion.

In addition, Vice President Morgan-Foster will discuss, with ASI President Cesar Rumayor, including the ASI vice presidents at the retreat.

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE – January 27, 2005

Page 5

In response to questions about a community representative, President Hughes noted that the strategic planning process is on the meeting agenda for the University Advisory Board (tonight). During the ensuing discussion, it was agreed that Randy Harris will make a presentation to the Advisory Board on the five-year goals, the mission and vision statement, and the core values.

WASC

Dr. Harris expressed his understanding that WASC has a number of different reporting requirements, including making strategic planning central to the university, but that is only one of several approaches. President Hughes responded that, in a way, it is a prerequisite. We could receive a reconsideration, because we don't have a strategic plan.

Provost Dauwalder commented that the question is whether, within our operational structure to achieve accreditation, we want to merge WASC in with strategic planning. President Hughes noted that the structure she drew on the board is not what WASC would like: SPSC with the committees under it and WASC off to the right. President Hughes concurred with the concerns expressed that the goals must be measurable, but also noted we should not be trying to set measurements to make ourselves look good, but rather to make us better.

Provost Dauwalder pointed out that at the last Cabinet meeting it was agreed to let the WASC work group review all of the proposals that have been advanced for restructuring or merging the committees/activities. The work group recommendations would then be discussed during the Cabinet retreat with the Senate Executive Committee and student representatives present.

It was understood that, ultimately, the recommendations would be brought back to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee for final discussion and approval.