

## STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE

November 14, 2002

### NOTES

President Hughes convened the second meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee on November 14, 2002. The October 31, 2002, meeting notes were distributed for information.

#### **Review of Pathways Documents**

President Hughes pointed out that the policies and priorities established by the CSU Board of Trustees must be factored in as an integral part of the campus strategic planning process. As an example, she referenced the recent discussions by the CSU Board of Trustees concerning campus master plan enrollment ceilings.

Subsequent discussion focused on the two "Pathways" documents — *Pathways to Opportunity* (1996 – Pathways I) and *Pathways to the Future* (1999 – Pathways II). Pathways I, identifies the key planning principles and core values that were approved by the Academic Senate and President. Pathways II, identifies the fundamental goals that the University committed to in order to make the self-study definition of learning a reality.

President Hughes again emphasized the importance of an assessment and evaluation component, which is integral to all University planning processes. With respect to the University's mission, President Hughes noted that mission reaffirmation might also include some changes.

#### **Status of Committees**

Provost Dauwalder discussed the need to clarify the roles and the processes used by each of the strategic planning committees. He noted that the overall structure has linear relations, where certain activities would only begin after another activity has been completed. A clear definition of the base we are working from, rather than everyone jumping in at the same time is important.

Dr. Dauwalder then reviewed the September 3 organization chart, which outlines the strategic planning committee structure. That structure has five committees (including MAP), two councils, and the Cabinet, all dealing with strategic planning. The process incorporates a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats), vision, mission, goals, priorities, and objectives.

President Hughes commented that the intent is to have all committees/subgroups advance their documents and recommendations through the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee (SGPC). The SGPC reviews the documentation received from the other committees, develops recommended goals and priorities, and forwards its recommendations and advice to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC).

Dr. Dauwalder noted that some committees deal primarily with long-range plans, while others are more short-range in nature. He expressed his belief that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee drives the process through which the vision and mission are developed; the Strategic Measurements and Performance Committee (SMPC) develops indicators based on the goals and

## **SPSC – November 14, 2002**

priorities that have been established; and the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) reviews mid-year budgets against current goals and priorities, and also recommends budget distributions against next year's future goals and priorities.

Dr. Dauwalder said, in his view, the Strategic Measurements and Performance Committee and the University Budget Advisory Committee are dealing with planning that is more short-term in nature. President Hughes acknowledged that those committees may start with short-term planning, but until both become longer term in their thinking and planning the University cannot achieve what it needs in order to move forward.

Vice President Stephens pointed out that when MAP and the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee provide longer-term goals, UBAC and the Strategic Measurements and Performance Committee will be able to respond. However, until UBAC is told that over the next five years this is where the University wants to be, they will continue to conduct reviews on an annual basis. She emphasized that understanding the range of vision for the operational groups is important, noting that the budget (UBAC) should not determine what the long-range visions are for the University.

In further discussions, it was noted that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee is involved in the long-range thinking, but its main function under short-range is to review what comes from the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee. MAP's purpose is to create the long-range vision and mission for Academic Affairs for 2003/04 and beyond.

Dr. Thompson commented that, if the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee will be driving the process, it might be necessary to review the membership of that group.

President Hughes asked whether the process should begin with the Strategic Planning Steering Committee going out with a proposed vision and mission. Dr. Dauwalder noted that some processes start with the vision and mission, while others begin with the goals and priorities, which then determine the vision and mission. He noted that the Deans' Council had a positive view of the previous planning process through MAP. However, the Senate Executive Committee's view was less positive, apparently because it did not include more faculty members.

President Hughes said it might be necessary to start fresh and identify a new process and name for the MAP group. Commenting that the process itself is new, Dr. Dauwalder concurred with the suggestion to rename MAP. Speaker-elect Aronson emphasized that, whatever MAP is replaced with, it is important to make sure it includes strong faculty voices and that the terms of service are extended for a longer period. President Hughes expressed her agreement.

Ms. Stephens pointed out that achieving the academic mission will require the technical expertise and support from the other campus divisions (Student Affairs, Business and Finance, and Development and University Relations). She emphasized the need for a clearer vision, mission and identification of priorities in order to provide the best possible guidance and direction to those units.

## **SPSC – November 14, 2002**

Dr. Dauwalder commented on the need to determine what our current vision and goals are for 2002/03 and then look at the 2003/04 priorities, in order to build the budget that will be needed very shortly.

Vice President Strong expressed his belief that the SWOT analysis should be introduced at a strategic point, so that everyone knows what the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats really are.

Dr. Thompson asked whether the development of assessment indicators for student learning and outcomes is a function of the Strategic Measurements and Performance Committee. Professor Randy Harris expressed his understanding that their function is to assess organizational outcomes and not student learning. Dr. Aronson asked where the other measurements of student success are in this process, noting the importance of a strong faculty voice in the student outcomes piece.

There was consensus regarding the need for clearer definitions of what is being measured, as well as a better understanding of the role and charge for each of the committees. The Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee will be asked to review all of the committee charges. It was pointed out that the different timelines, functions and discussions, which are occurring simultaneously, will present a major communication challenge to ensure that everyone understands how the process will work.

### Goals and Initiatives

President Hughes briefly commented on the Goals and Initiatives item. The document identifies the pledges set forth in *Pathways to the Future*, followed by some specific examples and the name of an individual(s) responsible. The purpose is to begin to frame a leadership direction, as the discussions are moved out for campus-wide review and consideration.

With respect to Goal #1 (creating a campus climate conducive to excellence in teaching and learning), Vice President Morgan-Foster expressed her view that all of the vice presidents should be involved. She noted that a major part of her responsibility is student quality of life. President Hughes concurred, noting that Tom Young would chair that initiative. It was suggested that Gary Novak also be invited to work with this group.

Other comments included: A.2, Honors Program – add Helena Janes (Jim Tuedio is on leave); C.2, Diversity Programs – add Fred Edmondson (Faculty Mentor Program); F.2, Faculty Center – Andy Young's replacement is currently being recruited.

Ms. Stephens commented on the importance of not setting up expectations on campus that we will be able to accomplish everything all at once. Some programs or initiatives will have to be phased in and choices made within the goals and strategic priorities that are established.

In response to questions, President Hughes said that the individuals listed would identify the procedures to lead a campus discussion about the critical issues involved with, for example, creating a campus climate conducive to excellence in teaching and learning. The purpose is to develop an action plan for engaging the campus community in discussions about these critical

## **SPSC – November 14, 2002**

issues. They would begin by designing the goals, parameters, and scope of their functions.

Dr. Aronson asked whether the intent is to measure what has been done to date, noting that these are not necessarily the goals and priorities that will be selected. Dr. Dauwalder expressed his view that the degree to which these elements should remain in our vision and mission is what should be addressed. A description of what has happened since the documents were created also might be included.

Subsequent to further discussion, President Hughes said that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee should begin by scheduling open hearings on the vision and mission and the goals the University should be operating from — is it 2002/03, or do we go back to 1996/97? The SPSC would then come back and determine what was learned through that process.

Dr. Aronson expressed concern that if these are the only goals going forward we may be closing out areas that should be included now. She pointed out that the process of identifying what has been accomplished might also suggest some new steps to take with those initiatives. Dr. Strong also asked whether the divisions or programs should be reviewing these initiatives, rather than these groups.

President Hughes responded that it is important to find out where we are in relation to the documents that have substantially guided the University's planning, rather than pushing them aside. What is finished? What needs to be added? What needs to be changed? The goal is to gain an understanding of the process and where we were in 1996/97, where we are in 2002/03, and how we will move forward.

**NEXT MEETING: Thursday, November 21, 2:00 - 3:00 p.m. in MSR 390.**