

California State University, Stanislaus
Joint Meeting of the University Strategic Goals and Planning Committee (USGPC)
and the Strategic Measurement and Performance Assessment Committee (SMPAC)
Friday, December 3, 2004

Present: Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, June Boffman, Ken Schoenly, Maithreyi Manoharan, Gary Lowe, Elaine Peterson, Denice Barr, Roger Pugh, Anne Harris, Amin Elmallah, Chet Jensen, Ted Wendt, Priscilla Peters, Fred Edmondson, Al Petrosky, Julia Reynoso, Chelsea Minor, Jim Klein, David Dauwalder, Janet King (recording)

J. Boffman began with around the table introductions and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to give the committee members an opportunity to discuss the roles of the committees and how they work in relation to each other. She noted that there have been difficulties and provided a brief history of the development of the strategic planning process in 2002/03 and 2003/04. She stated that the primary focus is to develop an effective process for development and measurement of the five year goals based on what we have learned from current efforts to measure and report progress on the annual goals. K. Jasek-Rysdahl distributed and explained a condensed version of the logic model for review and discussion.

Much discussion occurred with the following comments, notations, and concerns:

- Units don't have a process of sorting the unit goals from the strategic goals.
- Concern that there are too many goals - there are only two goals for 2004/05, but the explanation points make it much more than just two.
- Barbara Cambridge had noted that there were too many measures.
- There should be only a few measures at the university level, most indicators and detail should be at the unit level (pyramid theory). We are measuring issues that are unit driven - it is not strategic, it is operational.
- There should be fewer indicators than goals.
- There is a disconnect with the charges of the strategic committees.
- Suggestion to combine the goals and the measurement committees, so that there are only two committees, Strategic Goals and Budget.
- Process needs to be simplified, but remain inclusive.
- Suggestion to have and focus on only one goal each year.
- Suggestion to redesign how we ask for the 04/05 annual unit report.
- Strategic planning is not a one year process.
- There was consensus that people come to the committee representing their areas/background, not the university as a whole, as was the original purpose.
- Suggestion to set over arching goals then challenge the units to address them and define them at the unit level.
- There was general agreement that strategic goals need to be much more defined, to make it less necessary to have many measurements.

Frustration was expressed by members of both committees with the progress of the process over the last two years. There was agreement that a good plan for the five year goals should be in place prior to the arrival of a new President. It was noted that this experience has been a valuable learning experience and speaks well for all committee members.

Meeting Summary:

Members from the two committees agreed that we need fewer goals and measures. The goals need to be truly strategic. Units will be able to develop unit plans to address the specific goals. Developing measures from more clearly define goals will be more straightforward. The most important goal now is to learn from the last few years in order to develop 5 year goals that can direct strategic planning and lend themselves to measurement.

Recommendations:

- Reconstitute the committees into one (SMPAC and USGPC)
- Develop goals that are strategic and measurable for the 5 year goals
- SMPAC finish collecting the 03/04 data and narrative unit summaries and recommend a measurement process for the 04/05 annual goals
- Guide the university to recognize the difference between unit and strategic goals while valuing both
- Develop a reporting process that allows the university to recognize progress and define needs for improvement to meet strategic goals