

**STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 31, 2002**

NOTES

President Hughes convened the first meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on Thursday, October 31, 2002, in the President's Conference Room.

President Hughes noted that recommendations will come from the strategic planning committees, through the University Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee, to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. Executive Assistant Klein will serve as the coordinator for the overall strategic planning process. In addition, edited and updated versions of the strategic planning documents (white papers) that guided the Executive Cabinet retreat discussion in August will be available on the University Web site shortly.

With respect to the charge to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, President Hughes said that this committee would need to mobilize the campus in an effort to regain the momentum that, in her view, was lost when the MAP (Master Academic Planning) committee became inactive. President Hughes referenced the possibility of bringing in an outside consultant to help guide the campus process. She pointed out that the Steering Committee should identify ways to engage the entire campus in a dialogue about strategic planning independent of the committees that will provide reports to the USGPC.

Dr. Klein commented on a suggestion advanced by Assistant Vice President Hogan to develop a page on the University Web site devoted to the strategic planning process, where documents and updates would be posted on a periodic basis. References to this process also would be included in the Administrative BRIEF and elsewhere (e.g., University Digest, Stanislaus Magazine). The Web site would include a mechanism for submitting comments, which would be collected and provided to the strategic planning committees.

Speaker Mark Thompson referenced the September 3 strategic priorities and goals document and the contrast between the four areas. Noting that most people do not have strategic planning on their minds, he indicated it will be harder to get acceptance if the goals appear to be already established. Flexibility and openness to change are an important part of this process, as well as prioritization.

Dr. Hogan pointed out that the strategic planning process has already begun at the academic program review level with the departments. This process will occur at the strategic planning committee level down, but also from the faculty and chairs level up. Dr. Hogan said the strength with this process will be to have everything from environmental scans to support program and unit reviews.

Dr. Thompson commented that linking planning to budgeting can be a frightening concept. Whatever the reality, the perception might work against acceptance.

President Hughes suggested that the SPSC schedule a series of open sessions. She also said the intent at the retreat was to create some generic goals, without the type of specificity that would lock us in to those.

Vice President Stephens emphasized that, even in a good budget year, we will not be able to fund everything that is considered important. It will be important to have that discussions and input into making choices about what rises to the top.

Provost Dauwalder acknowledged that the goals distributed to the faculty on 9/3 were not the result of a very inclusive process because of the short timeline. We are beginning the process to develop goals for next year, based on campuswide input that will occur over a longer period of time.

President Hughes suggested a process that replicates WASC, or something comparable. Noting that we do not have the outcomes from the previous planning, Dr. Hughes asked what this committee would do to inform and engage the campus about Pathways II. What has changed as a result of Pathways to the Future? Some new programs have emerged that appear to be surviving and doing well, although there are some fiscal issues involving the Honors Program. Strategic planning is not always going to be about creating new programs. However, it will be important to identify the outcomes in terms of what is succeeding and what is not, what needs more attention, what needs to be withdrawn from the priorities, and what needs to be moved up on the priority list.

Vice President Strong commented that the operational plan becomes fundamental to assessing the priorities you are setting. A critical process issue is to review what we have come up with thus far. We have a preliminary set of raw strategic planning priorities and guidelines that need to be tested out as part of the communication process. Are these the broad parameters around which we want to develop this strategic plan? President Hughes responded that *Pathways to the Future* should serve as a foundation for moving the process forward.

In further discussions, Dr. Thompson pointed out that the goals have gone out to all of the Academic Senate standing committees and subcommittees for review. There was general consensus about the importance of assessing how we are doing based on Pathways I. In terms of outcomes, is everything that was committed to at that time strong and healthy? There are a number of areas in Pathways I that are incomplete and need to be addressed. A reaffirmation of the University's mission may also be important in this process.

With respect to Pathways I, Vice President Strong said that we are at a point of basically going out and saying this is the framework under which we came up with some broad strategic planning goals. If the feedback from faculty and others indicate a lot of areas that need to be included or changed, that suggests a need to review some mission and vision issues.

Dr. Dauwalder emphasized the importance of planning out the timeline. What do we expect to accomplish this year and what part would the other committees play in pulling this together?

SPSC – October 31, 2002

Dr. Hogan expressed her concern that it is not clear how long Pathways I was supposed to be in effect. How often will it be refreshed? President Hughes said that issue should remain open and not be locked in at this time. She referenced a flaw in the earlier planning, whereby a methodology to evaluate where we were at certain points in the process was not identified.

Professor J. J. Hendricks questioned what an overall planning framework would look like. Ms. Stephens pointed out that, for Business and Finance, the operational plan is what is needed to guide their work. Dr. Strong expressed his belief that the statement on page 5 (*Pathways to the Future*) represents the most important and dynamic strategic framework statement.

Discussion ensued regarding the six-county concept and what is considered to be our “region” in relation to the statewide perspective of the CSU system. President Hughes noted that the CSU does not talk about regions. Campuses are expected to manage the populations adjacent to them and use some broad guidelines, but the term region is not used in Long Beach. Ms. Stephens referenced one exception in which region becomes a very real concept - enrollment management. Campuses are not restricted to specific regions, but they do have a first obligation.

Communication Structures

Noting that the Academic Senate has structures in place, President Hughes asked whether they are actively engaged. Are the Senators communicating with the departments? Also, are the academic deans communicating with the faculty?

Ms. Stephens noted concern about the effectiveness of the University Facilities Policy Committee (UFPC) structure, in terms of representatives, including faculty, reporting back to their constituents. President Hughes said that representatives from constituent groups who are assigned to various committees should be expected to keep their constituents apprised of what is occurring.

President Hughes asked Dr. Dauwalder about his plans for appointing or reconvening the Provost’s Council. Dr. Dauwalder noted that this group could function as one means of collecting and getting information out. Other constituents who should be considered to gain community support are external groups and alumni/ae.

In response to questions about how to reach a greater variety of students, other than through the ASI and University Union, Vishal Chunilal expressed his belief that most students do not routinely use the Web site. He noted that word-to-word is the way it tends to happen.

Ms. Stephens commented that an active rather than passive process, such as open forums or sessions, would be more effective.

Speaker-elect Melissa Aronson suggested giving people a reason to get involved by tying some strategic planning concepts around forums that are focused on more exciting or controversial topics. For example, academic freedom or parking. In response to comments, Dr. Aronson pointed out that the parking issue ties back to enrollment management and where we are going.

SPSC – October 31, 2002

Dr. Dauwalder commented on two possible directions at this point. One would be to take *Pathways to the Future* and go through a public reconsideration and affirmation process based on a relatively short timeline. If the resulting decision is to reaffirm, or make a few adaptations, we would then move on to the next steps. An alternative is to look at the entire strategic planning process, build-in the measurements we are talking about in a relatively short time, apply those to this process, and then draw some conclusions. The latter would take more time, but would be data-driven. The former would be more of a perception of where we are. Dr. Dauwalder stressed the need to come to a specific plan of what we will be doing in the next year.

Noting that *Pathways to the Future* came out three years ago, Ms Stephens said that the new initiatives are already established. Dr. Klein commented that the goals (page 7) are more global, and we need to be able to determine how we are doing. He asked whether data could be generated to demonstrate where we were three years ago compared to now.

Dr. Hughes suggested that she and Dr. Klein develop a plan on how to engage the campus in discussions around *Pathways to the Future*. As part of that process, Dr. Hogan would be asked to determine what data exists in the system to evaluate or relate to that document.

Dr. Hogan expressed her belief that the goals are too generic to tie to any data. In response, President Hughes noted that several of the goals could be assessed, such as maximizing student access and the needs of diverse populations. Dr. Dauwalder noted that this would be the first task of the Strategic Measurements and Performance Committee. Ms. Stephens commented on the need to be more specific about how we are trying to achieve these goals in order to make the measurements worthwhile. For example, there are many different ways to accomplish the first goal and we need to identify the ones we intend to follow.

Professor Randy Harris also commented on the important links to enrollment management. Referring to earlier statements, he asked for clarification as to the CSU system perspective on service regions. President Hughes responded that the comments were in the context of the CSU Board of Trustees discussions regarding the budget. Currently, nearly 20,000 students are admitted systemwide without any funding. In addition, the 2003/04 budget contains a 5% targeted increase. What we are expected to do, as a 23-campus system, is to manage enrollment at each of our campuses to address the needs of both the state and region.

President Hughes noted that she would work with Jim Klein and Tom Young to design a campuswide discussion process around *Pathways to the Future*, to determine what has been accomplished and to begin to talk about where we go from here.

Regarding the goals (page 7), Ms. Stephens asked how they would be fleshed out. For example, what does it mean to create a campus climate? What is the climate we want?

Vice President Strong expressed concern about the effort to align the budget with planning this year. Is it feasible given the significant amount of planning that needs to be done? He suggested devoting this year to planning and working with an ad hoc budget for one more year. President

SPSC – October 31, 2002

Hughes responded that it is important to make as much progress as possible this year, while continuing to communicate and move incrementally to the various stages.

Ms. Stephens pointed out that, as we go into a period of constrained resources, it is even more critical to reach some consensus about what our core mission is and what programs we are going to protect that are essential to that core. Dr. Hogan agreed, noting that prioritization is going to be the key.

President Hughes requested that committee members provide additional comments to Jim Klein. In the meantime, President Hughes, Jim Klein, and Tom Young will proceed to design a process for follow through.

Schedule of Meetings

There was consensus that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee should try to meet on a bi-weekly basis, preferably Thursday afternoons.

The next meeting is on Thursday, November 14, from 1:30 to 2:30 p.m., in MSR 390.

At that time, an effort will be made to calendar out future meetings through the academic year. Also, a plan for campuswide communication will be discussed.

The next issue of the Administrative BRIEF will indicate that the SPSC has convened. The preliminary goal is to plan a process for campuswide consultation regarding the strategic plan, *Pathways to the Future*.