

STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE

August 30, 2004

SUMMARY NOTES

President Hughes convened the tenth meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on August 30, 2004. Present: Marvalene Hughes; June Boffman; David Dauwalder; Steve Filling; Al Petrosky; Bill Ruud; Mary Stephens; Stacey Morgan-Foster; Deanie Brown; Randall Harris; Mario Estrella; and Julia Fahrenbruch. Not Present: Cathy Watkins and Phil Rojas.

President Hughes began the discussion by pointing out that strategic planning and facilities master planning are not driven by a president, but by a campus culture that engages in planning. It is appropriate to continue working toward the implementation of our institutionalized goals and priorities.

CORE PLANNING COMMITTEE

June Boffman reviewed recommendations resulting from the Executive Cabinet retreat to establish a strategic planning core planning committee (Attachment A), comprised of representatives of the larger strategic planning committees. Using the visioning process model, the smaller core group will conduct the specific detail work including: (1) planning for the university-wide strategic planning workshop; (2) reviewing background materials in preparation for committee use; (3) refining proposed strategic goals and objectives prior to campus review; and (4) seeking input from numerous constituent groups .

Following discussion, there was general consensus that the core planning committee membership should include Vice President Dauwalder, Vice President Stephens, Speaker Filling and/or Speaker-Elect Petrosky, and Randy Harris. June Boffman will consult with various experts on campus, including April Hejka-Ekins and Gene Murti, to obtain additional advice and recommendations.

DEFINE CONSULTATION NEEDS AND RECOMMEND CONSULTANT

June Boffman reviewed two proposals from potential consultants to conduct the university-wide workshop and provide additional advice during the course of the coming year. Dr. Boffman also reviewed the objectives of the proposed workshop to be scheduled in October:

The process for the year will include:

October 2004 – conducting a workshop to engage in campus-wide consultation and provide feedback to the process;

November 2004 – defining what needs to be done to identify the goals (based on the workshop, validation of the SWOT analysis, etc.) and complete the environmental scan;

January 2005 – writing the University goals;

February 2005 – defining the objectives to measure our goals (performance indicators);

March and April 2005 – receiving campus input and buy-in by the end of the academic year.

Regarding the consultant proposals, President Hughes pointed out that, although we have comparable levels of expertise on campus, it is a matter of whether we gain from an external expert.

Dr. Boffman noted that the costs, based on the two current proposals, range between \$6,000-\$7,000 plus travel; the consultant would make 3 or 4 trips to campus during the 2004-05 Academic Year.

The ensuing discussions focused on the pros and cons of an outside consultant versus internal experts. Steve Filling expressed his belief that, given all the expertise available on campus, it is not necessary to go outside. He questioned the type of message that would send, especially to community groups/leaders to whom the University promotes its faculty experts. Randy Harris pointed out that an outside consultant doesn't have a vested interest in the outcome; represents a disinterested moderator to the discussion. Al Petrosky said it is not necessarily true that an outsider doesn't have a vested interest, due to having been identified and recruited by someone on campus. In response to earlier comments, Deanie Brown pointed out that going with an outsider doesn't mean it is a rejection of the expertise available on campus.

With respect to the potential for internal conflicts if an inside person were appointed to lead the process, Provost Dauwalder commented that the professional schools are very supportive of the Liberal Arts background, which they count on to produce stronger professionals. Noting that he does not see the degree of internal conflicts at CSU Stanislaus that he has seen at other places, Dr. Dauwalder expressed his belief that getting a good result will not necessarily require an outside person.

President Hughes asked, if we reach a point where the need for a fairly dramatic change is identified during our strategic planning, would that best be led by us or by an outside person? Vice President Stephens expressed her belief that the University should be leading any dramatic changes. Provost Dauwalder also commented that, whether inside or outside, the leader would not be driving what is happening on campus. Vice President Morgan-Foster noted that since the University has already accomplished a great deal, using our own internal resources might result in less kickback from on campus groups/individuals.

Additional pros and cons noted were: (1) an outside consultant, or strategic planning guru, might add some additional motivation and momentum to the campus process; (2) the timeliness of making a decision is an important factor, given the need to obtain references and look at the scope of the outside individuals experiences, in addition to seeking internal proposal(s); (3) the campuses where the two individuals are from do not have well developed strategic plans in place; (4) the need for assistance in identifying the primary elements to be included in an environmental scan is another important component of this process.

Regarding the University of Northern Iowa Strategic Plan (2001-2006), which was provided as an example of a good planning document with very specific performance indicators, President Hughes asked that Dr. Boffman try to identify who led their planning process.

Following additional discussion, there was general support for the use of an internal consultant, if possible. President Hughes noted that if the decision is to go with an internal consultant, it will be important to compensate or provide release time for that individual. Dr. Boffman reported that the faculty expert from Politics and Public Administration recommended seeking an external consultant. The College of Business has three experts; Drs. Filling and Petrosky indicated that two are not available to serve due to other obligations. Dr. Boffman and Dr. Harris agreed to meet to determine if he would be willing to serve as the campus consultant.

There also was general agreement to conduct the campus-wide workshop on October 6, 2004. In response to questions regarding the purpose, Dr. Boffman said the goal is to come away with an understanding of the essential elements of our strategic planning model and to develop a “project plan” to define the five year strategic goals and seek input from stakeholders (on and off campus).

VISION AND CORE VALUES CONFIRMATION PLAN

Dr. Boffman reported that over 500 people were involved in the visioning process this past year, noting that the draft vision statement has been on the campus Web site for some time now. In response to questions, Dr. Boffman pointed out that not everyone has formally seen the final draft, which is the outcome of the work conducted this past year. In addition, suggestions from the Cabinet retreat are not reflected in the current draft. The Visioning Subcommittee will review those, and any other suggestions, and determine whether additional changes will be made. When the vision statement is submitted for final review to the campus community, it will be made clear that this document is the result of significant campus consultation during the 2003-04 Academic Year. The next step in the process is how to put it into practice.

Speaker Filling commented that, in reality, what is on this paper doesn't really matter if people don't try to live it — this is what you said your values were and we are trying to enunciate that in this document. It does need to evolve.

In response to additional comments, President Hughes pointed out that we have made broad statements about having a dynamic strategic plan and we need to continually reiterate that it is a living document – a dynamic process. We will continue the culture of dynamic strategic planning.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Two draft documents were distributed: (1) the charge/membership statements for each of the strategic planning committees, and (2) the appointment guidelines for the strategic planning committees. (Attachment B incorporates several corrections requested during discussion.)

There was general consensus to: (1) retain, to the extent possible, current appointments in order to provide consistency and stability for the coming year's activities; (2) rely on Provost Dauwalder to decide who should assume responsibility for chairing or co-chairing the Strategic Measurements and Performance Assessment Committee; and (3) rely on the Committee on Committees to ensure an appropriate mix of faculty appointments to each of the Strategic Planning Committees (e.g., Colleges, Library, Counseling, UEPC).

Speaker Filling asked that the 2004/05 Strategic Goals and Priorities be distributed at the General Faculty meeting (8/30/04).