

**STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE**  
**March 24, 2003**

**NOTES**

President Hughes convened the fourth meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on March 24, 2003.

***Strategic Planning Fora (March 4/5)***

Draft summary notes from the March 4 and 5 fora were distributed for review. President Hughes requested that Jim Klein prepare a content analysis that identifies specific outcomes from the fora discussions. Because the “open discussion summary” portion (pages 6-9) attributes comments to specific individuals, the Committee requested that permission be obtained from the individuals listed prior to publishing the notes on the University’s Strategic Planning Web site. (Note: Copies were distributed to each individual with a response requested by 4/21.)

Comments about what was learned from the open fora are summarized as follows:

- The fora represented a good first step, by starting the process and opening up communications.
- The messages at both fora were not significantly different.
- The participation rate was low and included individuals who are already deeply involved in the process, plus a few new comers.
- The comments were at a very high, non-substantive level.
- The students have not been engaged in discussions about the University Mission statement.
- A process for institutionalizing the reaffirmed Mission statement should be identified, and the University should use every opportunity to publicize it (e.g., Commencement, Administrative BRIEF, etc.).
- No feedback was received via the Strategic Planning Web site.
- What can we do to institutionalize strategic planning and our learning mission? It seems clear that this has not happened to the extent desired in the initial planning process.

There was general support for the idea of going out through the existing committee structures to obtain a more focused review and feedback. For example, take the ten goals (white papers) and schedule a number of different open sessions, with several committee members running each one. This would allow a one-hour discussion on one topic, rather than ten topics. The data collected about what was learned from that process would be reported to the full committee.

It was noted that the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee (SGPC) would review the white papers. In addition, there was general consensus that the SGPC should develop both long-term and short-term goals.

Additional comments/questions offered included:

- What impact will the current budget situation have on the ability to maintain the overall goals and priorities?
- At what point will the connection be made between the strategic priorities and the resources available to accomplish those priorities?

- Do we have a vision for the University, other than learning-centered?
- Can we express “Pathways” in a brief paragraph?
- The current goals are somewhat vague and generalized. In a time of decreasing resources, what is it that we are committed to? Is there something more strategic or visionary that can be pulled out?
- Can we develop an expanded definition of what we do and for whom? Do we serve only students or do we also serve the community?
- Does the external community have a role in guiding the University vision?
- How do we engage each constituent in a strategic way, rather than being all encompassing?
- What programmatic mix is needed by the population we serve? Are we here to serve the needs of the Central Valley, the State of California, or a more global population?
- What is the role of a state institution, as defined in public policy? What factors provide guidance (e.g., bargaining agreements; legislation; executive orders; Trustee policy; etc.)

In response to questions, President Hughes stated that her vision relates, first and foremost, to quality and standards of excellence, which are essential University concepts. The tendency is to focus on under girding the University to accomplish what it is already doing, rather than to address strategic programmatic or directional changes.

Dr. Aronson suggested the University solicit, from different constituencies, adjectives to fill in the blank to the following statement: “Building quality for a \_\_\_\_\_ future for the Central Valley.”

Note: The Strategic Planning URL will be repeated in the Administrative BRIEF.

### ***Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee (SGPC)***

Provost Dauwalder reviewed the activities and progress of the SGPC, noting that the consultation process has involved both internal and external constituencies. Subgroups were created to work on the goals, consolidate the information, and report back to the full committee. Responses from a broad base of campus and community groups were collected.

Dr. Dauwalder reported that the SGPC would meet on April 3, to review and prepare additional information for subsequent distribution to constituent groups, and campuswide, for comment. The results of that process will be brought to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee for review and further discussion. It was noted that the process has been very open and participatory.