

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE

May 23, 2003

NOTES

President Hughes convened the fifth meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on May 23, 2003. Present: Marvalene Hughes; Melissa Aronson; Steve Filling; Walter Strong; Mary Stephens; Stacey Morgan-Foster; Don Bowers (for Provost Dauwalder); Roseann Hogan; Randall Harris; J. J. Hendricks; and Julia Fahrenbruch. Not Present: Jim Klein; Phil Rojas; Cathy Watkins; Matthew Avilla.

STRATEGIC PLANNING ORGANIZATION CHART

It was reported that the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) had considerable involvement during the past year with the strategic planning process, but is still trying to determine how it interfolds or relates with the University Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee (USGPC).

Vice President Stephens reported that UBAC and the USGPC met to discuss whether the appropriate interpretation is a strict reporting or consultative relationship. The general consensus was that the relationship was not strict reporting, in the sense that UBAC expected its recommendations to be approved or changed before going to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC). The intent is to express that whatever the UBAC recommendations are, they must be driven by the goals and priorities established by the USGPC.

Speaker Aronson concurred with Vice President Stephens' interpretation, noting that the time elements this past year were not optimal. The meetings with UBAC and USGPC need to occur earlier in the process. Ideally, USGPC would prepare its recommendations by February or March, which would then go to the University Strategic Measurements and Performance Assessment Committee (USMPAC) and to UBAC to consider how they can be implemented in terms of measurements and funding.

President Hughes commented that one of her goals, as part of a campus communication plan, is to have UBAC follow what is happening in Sacramento and to inform the campus on a regular basis.

Later in the discussions, President Hughes indicated that the organization chart would be discussed at the Cabinet retreat in August.

OPEN FORA

President Hughes said that the open fora resulted in a recommitment to the learning centered philosophy, but also focused on how that philosophy can be institutionalized and communicated on a routine basis. The suggestions included training opportunities to define what learning-centered means to the faculty, to staff, and to students.

STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHEET

President Hughes distributed and reviewed proposed worksheets for use with the three goals identified by the USGPC.

In follow up to earlier comments about the organization chart, Speaker-Elect Filling expressed his belief that UBAC's concerns were not about changing or throwing away any of the goals, but about how multi-year processes would be incorporated. It is important to include something about the future, to make it explicit that this is being carried forward and to identify how it will be institutionalized.

Speaker-Elect Filling questioned where the initiative funds provided last year fit into the planning for next year (e.g., Career Center, ALS Development Officer, Globalization, Extended Education)? He expressed his belief that the University should be able to report at year-end how those funds were utilized.

Speaker Arson asked to what extent the Committee would work with prior-year goals to develop down the line, or do we start completely over? Starting from a blank slate process created some of the confusion. As we move forward, it is important to ensure that we honor the process itself and avoid the perception that decisions are made by a lobbying process, rather than an organized strategic planning process.

Vice President Stephens questioned whether the intent is to measure only those things that are responsive to the three goals? She pointed out that Business and Finance is heavily infrastructure oriented, as are OIT, the Library, and the instructional program, with the majority of dollars in existing programs. The guidance needed is how, over the years, are those base dollars redirected so that we begin to achieve the goals or to look different based on the direction the goals and priorities are taking us.

Vice President Strong commented on the need for a definition of “budgetary alignment” and “available resources,” noting that some goals and priorities can be accomplished within “existing resources,” some will “cost nothing,” and others will require “new resources.” Once defined within those categories, the goals and priorities would be brought back through the strategic planning process and rolled up for a final determination. Vice President Stephens noted that another option is to stop doing something and reallocate those dollars within existing resources, rather than trying to identify new dollars.

Assistant Vice President Hogan expressed her understanding that the intent is for the vice presidents to use the worksheets to identify what they are contributing or proposing for the University, for how many years out, and the anticipated costs.

Following additional recommendations regarding the worksheet format, President Hughes concurred with the recommendations to add the following columns: “Projected Activities, 3-5 years,” and, “Goal Status: Implemented – Institutionalized – Completed.” President Hughes reported that the revised goals worksheets would be submitted to the vice presidents to use over the summer in preparation for the discussions at the Executive Cabinet retreat in August.

UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC GOALS AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE (USGPC)

Following an extensive discussion of career services, there was general consensus that it was not the intent of the USGPC to advance a minority position or to place any limits or constraints on individual unit programs. The USGPC did not feel it appropriate to name specific programs, preferring to leave those determinations to the unit managers.

The Strategic Planning Steering Committee supported the strategic goals and priorities advanced by the USGPC and recommended approval with an amendment to item (1) a., which added the words “career development” (see attachment). President Hughes approved the recommendations and a final version was distributed to the University community on May 23, 2003.

Vice President Stephens reported that another hearing would be held in the fall for the divisions to report on how their cuts have been implemented. With respect to new projects, she again commented on the importance of closing the loop by reevaluating what we will continue to do in light of the new initiatives.

Assistant Vice President Hogan asked when the vice presidents would provide indicators and how the USMPAC would work to obtain the specifics?

In response, Speaker Aronson outlined her understanding of the sequence, in which the SPSC would make its recommendations to the President, who accepts or modifies and sends the final version to the vice presidents. The vice presidents would then work with their managers to interpret the University strategic goals and priorities within their respective units for the budget process. She noted that a specific timeframe remains to be determined, but might be part of what is done over the summer.

President Hughes confirmed that the approved University strategic goals and priorities will form the foundation for the Executive Cabinet retreat discussion in August, along with the worksheets to be completed by the vice presidential units.

UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC MEASUREMENTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (USMPAC)

Following discussion, Vice President Stephens commented on the importance of including the operational support that Business and Finance provides to students as a part of the University Strategic Measurements and Performance Assessment Committee process.

Speaker Aronson commented on the need to identify where faculty are involved and to ensure that all processes are moving forward with the involvement of the appropriate faculty governance committees. For example, “student success” should involve the University Educational Policy Committee (UEPC) early on in the planning process. The faculty must be involved in the development of the data collection instruments to ensure that the data generated is of value to the faculty. Each of the items should have appropriate links to faculty governance.

Assistant Vice President Hogan concurred, noting that the intent is to use the same language that appears on the approved University strategic goals and priorities document.

Assistant Vice President Hogan asked whether a Senate Executive Committee representative should be appointed to serve on the committee. Vice President Stephens pointed out that the Chair-Elect of the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) would attend UBAC meetings, as an ex officio member. She suggested considering similar arrangements for the UEPC and other faculty governance committees.

President Hughes asked that Speaker Aronson prepare a recommended communication model for involving faculty governance in the planning and implementation process for discussion with the SPSC. Speaker Aronson concurred with the request.

STRATEGIC PLANNING EVALUATION

Following discussion, it was agreed that the members of the strategic planning committees will be asked to evaluate the performance of their respective committees using the evaluation form developed by Assistant Vice President Hogan. In response to questions regarding a timeframe, President Hughes indicated her intent to request that the members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee respond by mid-July, so that the information is available for use at the Cabinet retreat in August.

Note: During a subsequent Cabinet meeting (5/27), Jim Klein indicated he would work with Roseann Hogan to prepare and distribute a final version of the evaluation form to the members of the strategic planning committees.

In addition, it was agreed that Assistant Vice President Hogan would develop an open-ended process for faculty, staff and students to provide feedback regarding their observations and perceptions of, and participation in, the University strategic planning process this past year. Recommendations for the future also would be requested. It was further understood that this process would be initiated following the General Faculty meeting in September, when the President presents the University strategic goals and priorities for 03/04.

STRATEGIC PLANNING CALENDAR

Vice President Stephens recommended establishing a calendar of meeting dates or timelines for all of the strategic planning committees. President Hughes responded that a calendar or timeline would be discussed at the Executive Cabinet retreat in August.