

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE

February 16, 2004

SUMMARY NOTES

President Hughes convened the seventh meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on February 16, 2004. Members Present: Marvalene Hughes; June Boffman; David Dauwalder; Melissa Aronson; Steve Filling; Mary Stephens; Stacey Morgan-Foster; J. J. Hendricks; Cathy Watkins; Joshua Koch; and Julia Fahrenbruch. Not Present: Randall Harris; Phil Rojas; Roseann Hogan.

KEY INDICATORS FOR 03/04 GOALS AND PRIORITIES

June Boffman reported that the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee is currently reviewing the draft key indicators. Dr. Boffman asked for comments from the Strategic Planning Steering Committee as to whether those indicators represent the kinds of final measures that should be used.

Vice President Stephens commented that the housing retention rate might be one good indicator. Public safety, facilities maintenance, and food service could feed up under that, in terms of how they may impact a student's decision to stay or go. Speaker Aronson pointed out, however, that when you look at the enrollment patterns and the initiatives to divert freshmen to the community colleges (our largest group in housing), we are going to be comparing against some changing budget situations and priorities. Professor Hendricks commented on the importance of monitoring, over time, how those qualifying indicators are changing.

Speaker Aronson also noted that the budget situation will change a lot of things and, prior to March 2, we won't know for certain how much. She also pointed out that the housing considerations are transitional. If that piece still holds, you will expect a normal transition out. Dr. Hendricks commented that unless you measure this you won't know what normal is. Students may leave for economic reasons as well; conducting exit interviews might help.

Executive Assistant Boffman pointed out that the logic model has many layers overall, plus unit objectives — first, review the issues that support the main objective and try to identify the overall indicators, and then go back to the logic model to identify all the other pieces.

President Hughes commented on the need to address changing communication patterns, which is important programmatically. Dr. Boffman agreed, noting that the last page of the logic model (Goal 23.A - to enhance regular and effective internal and external communication) indicates that objective and some possible actions.

President Hughes questioned an item on the one-page handout, which states "Maintain a healthy, safe physical environment," noting that safety is not just a reduction in the crime rates (e.g., proper lighting; repairing potholes; ADA; emergency preparedness; a psychological environment that is healthy--free from harassment, hate crimes; alcohol abuse, etc.). Assistant Deanie Brown suggested deleting the word "physical" from the statement to get at the President's concern.

Follow up: The SPSC members were asked to provide feedback on the draft indicators via email to Dr. Boffman.

VISIONING PROCESS UPDATE

History

Executive Assistant Boffman requested SPSC guidance as to the kind of material that might ultimately be posted on the Web or distributed through other methods.

With respect to the campus history, Dr. Boffman reported that the former Archivist had already interviewed many of the people she had previously identified and those interviews are available on tape.

Dr. Boffman reported on conversations with History Department Professor Nancy Taniguchi about a possible class project. In the ensuing discussions, it was emphasized that the assignments would be strictly voluntary and a number of assignment options from which students could select for course credit would be available. Speaker-Elect Filling emphasized the need to ensure the students have been properly informed in terms of course credit and the possibility that their work could be posted on the Web or otherwise made available.

Speaker Aronson suggested that the impact the campus has had on the region should be included. For example, what has happened to Turlock and the surrounding area since the campus was established? How was Turlock selected over other areas (Modesto; Stockton) as the campus site? Vice President Stephens noted that two different approaches are being suggested – the political history and the economic history. Who is the intended audience? Professor Watkins cautioned that some sensitivity still remains within the external communities regarding some of these issues. In further conversations, it was generally understood that not everything would go on the Web, but should be available as part of the campus history in other forms (e.g., brochures, the catalogue, library archives, etc.).

Dr. Boffman noted that, for purposes of the visioning process, it is helpful to understand the campus history in order to understand where you want to go. Vice President Ruud also commented on the need for everyone to have the same basis of information — facts that people can then use to tell various stories. He suggested identifying early campus partnerships as well.

Follow up: The SPSC members were asked to provide additional feedback via email to Dr. Boffman. Dr. Boffman reported that she will continue to work with Professor Taniguchi, and also noted the need to identify someone to edit the final copy of documents. Students will not be asked to assume this responsibility.

Campus/Community Input

In response to questions from President Hughes regarding how the external community would be engaged, Dr. Boffman noted that suggestions have included contacting alumni, as well as the members of the various boards (Foundation, University Advisory, and the College boards).

President Hughes asked that Dr. Boffman work with Vice President Ruud to add “corporate leaders” to the list.

Dr. Boffman said the goal is to create a vision statement that will help define where we want to be or what we want to become by 2010. In addition, the process will include defining our educational values. From that we can develop a slogan. A visioning poster session is planned for sometime in March to seek input on the evolving themes and values statements. Once everything is pulled together a visioning exchange will be scheduled.

With respect to the proposed timeline, Dr. Boffman noted that some projects or assignments may start in a particular month, but will be on-going.

During discussions regarding the Web site, it was suggested that links be included under “What’s New,” the “President’s Welcome,” and the “Strategic Planning” pages, in addition to posting the Web site address. Vice President Morgan-Foster suggested posting a continuous message running across the main page, similar to the one used for the Summer Reading program. Vice President Stephens suggested including articles in the Signal and the University Digest. Dr. Aronson suggested asking faculty to announce it in their classes and, subsequently, asked Dr. Filling to include this for discussion with the Academic Senate next week.

Dr. Boffman reported that the last piece involves identifying a group to put it all together – summarizing final themes and shared values to help prepare the vision statement. Dr. Hendricks noted that the group should be representative. Dr. Aronson agreed, but also stressed the importance of having a strong faculty voice in all of this – if it is going to have meaning over time it will have to have faculty buy-in. She noted her desire to define “faculty governance” as all of the Senate Executive Committee members (which includes at least two department chairs within it). With respect to “student governance,” it was suggested that all students serving on each of the strategic planning committees, plus the ASI President be included.

In response to concerns expressed by Dr. Aronson, Dr. Boffman noted that efforts are being made to identify a facilitator who would be willing to do this without compensation. The options include someone from the local community or a retired faculty member who has that expertise.

Follow up: The SPSC members were asked to provide feedback regarding the group membership via email to Dr. Boffman. Dr. Boffman also noted that a date for the visioning summit should be identified soon, in order to provide early notification for planning calendars.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Dr. Boffman recommended a change to the current structure, whereby the chair of the Strategic Measurements and Performance Assessment Committee would serve on the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee to allow for better communication and direct linkage. Dr. Aronson expressed her belief that the same problem exists with the University Budget Advisory Committee.

President Hughes commented that, rather than expecting Dr. Boffman to translate and link the conversations between each of the committees, the chairs should be talking to each other on a routine basis.

In response to the conversations about the need to integrate or link all three committees together, Provost Dauwalder pointed out that the original purpose of the current structure was to ensure that the Goals and Priorities Committee was not identifying goals based on whether or not they could be measured.

Vice President Stephens noted that there are operational issues to consider as well. The goals need to be stated in a way that can be measured in order to help the operational units make the decisions they need to make; they cannot be totally independent. Professor Hendricks commented that it might be necessary to adjust the way we think about the goals.

In further discussions, Dr. Dauwalder suggested that the effort of creating the five-year picture, which is more strategic-direction oriented, and separately doing the one-year operational goals may help address those concern. The year-to-year goals will be more operational.

Dr. Dauwalder also emphasized the need to understand the basic concept – the four committees are there for a purpose; there probably will never be any perfect measures for the goals. It is important to look at these as “indicators” that are suggestive as to the progress being made.

Dr. Filling also commented on a basic problem that exists with respect to integrating the committees — if you are both setting the goals and designing the measurements system, you inevitably end up making yourself look better.

President Hughes also noted that the SPSC and the SGPC were established as directional thinkers. The other two are functional, rather than directional. Dr. Hughes cautioned that the SMPAC should not be identifying specific goals and objectives; that is the responsibility of the units.

Following further discussion, Dr. Boffman suggested the more simple change of adding the chair of the SMPAC to the SGPC.

Follow up: There was general agreement to add the chair of the Strategic Measurements and Performance Assessment Committee to the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee.

Follow up: There was general consensus that the chairs of the Strategic Planning Committees would meet with June Boffman (as co-chair of the SPSC) on a regular basis – every other week throughout the term.

STRATEGIC PLANNING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN REVIEW (2003/04)

Vice President Stephens commented on the need to identify what can and cannot be done this year, noting that it won't be feasible to do everything at once. She also noted that some things may be more doable than others, which does not mean the others are not important.

With respect to Item I, #1 (enrollment targets), under Academic Excellence, Speaker Aronson pointed out that the campus enrollment targets will change in 04/05 by direction of the Chancellor. She stressed the importance of a strong faculty voice in developing the enrollment plan and targets, noting that the Chairs of the UEPC (University Educational Policy Committee)

and the Graduate Council are meeting with Roger Pugh to ensure a stronger faculty voice in Strategic Enrollment Management.

With respect to Item I, #2 (faculty and staff), under Academic Excellence, Speaker Aronson referred to comments made by the CSU Statewide Academic Senate that hiring and retention goals may be met by not hiring anybody – cutting recruitment and hiring numbers down because of the budget situation.

Cathy Watkins asked, regarding item #2, what is meant by “reconfigure as necessary” and “review workloads”? Vice President Stephens noted that, for Business and Finance, when an employee leaves they review the function and core services within current staffing and reconfigure, as appropriate; the position might be eliminated. The objective is to avoid lay offs.

Dr. Hendricks also commented on the need to revisit the process by which departments ask for positions and address the situation in an ongoing way.

With respect to faculty workload, Dr. Dauwalder said that part of the issue relates our ability to measure the use of faculty to perform a variety of roles, including instructional and non-instructional support elements. He noted that the integrated planning project has helped in planning and projecting workload far earlier.

Vice President Morgan-Foster suggested grouping like things together (e.g., health and wellness) as another way to organize, and to help identify some of the redundancies or to bring more focus among all divisions.

In response to concerns expressed by Provost Dauwalder, it was understood that the above conversations relate to planning for 2004/05; we are not rewriting the 2003/04 goals.

President Hughes commented on the need to acknowledge the budget shortfalls and to be able to overlay the budget as part of the implementation process in 2004/05.