

California State University, Stanislaus
University Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee
Meeting Notes
Friday, May 14, 2004

1. Review of Meeting Notes. Meeting notes of March 19 and April 2 meetings were approved.

2. a. Final review of 2003–2004 Strategic Goals, Priorities & Measurement Key Indicators. J. Boffman explained that the last two items of 1.b. were added at the request of the SEC.

- *Comparable Faculty Salaries* – there was consensus for taking out ‘faculty’ so the bullet would refer to all personnel – both faculty and staff.
- *Assigned time use* – discussion followed regarding what it is, how it can be measured, and if it can be measured system-wide. It was suggested that it may be better to look at teaching loads rather than assigned time.

Discussion followed regarding retention rates comparing sophomore year to junior year (1.a.). It was noted that this campus seems to experience the greatest loss at that time and that further study as to why this happens is needed. It was noted that qualitative assessment of the academic technology is needed (1.d.).

Approved with change to *Comparable Faculty Salaries* (1.b., 3rd bullet) and seconded.

2. b. Final review of 2003–2004 Measurement Logic Model. It was agreed that the document will be dated with a final approval date and noted that it was is a product of the Strategic Measurements & Performance Assessment Committee (SMPAC) and the University Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee (USGPC) – a campus-wide committee.

Discussion followed:

- It was noted that the Measurement Committee considers columns A-D to be final for this year.
- # 5, Graduation Rates. The committee requests the comparison to by year to year, rather than a 3 year average.
- Baseline – 02/03 is the baseline year unless otherwise stated. For areas without baseline information, 03/04 will be used to establish a baseline.
- #48 – This area will be best addressed in a qualitative report. Discussion followed regarding communication to and from the staff. Will this document become larger or smaller? J. Boffman stated she would like to see it get tighter and more strategic, and to address things that can be compared year to year.
- The logic model headings need definitions; J. Boffman agreed it would be helpful and will provide a guide. Roger Pugh commented that a format that can be used across the university is needed. The logic model might serve as the format.
- #51 – K Schoenly stated it would be helpful to know which partnerships are bottom-up vs top down (who initiated the partnerships, faculty or administrators). The plan calls for identifying partnerships, K Schoenly suggested we also indicate the outcomes of the partnerships.
- J. Boffman asked if the committee can agree to accept the document for this year, and stated that it needs to be distributed to everyone responsible for implementation and measurement. Moved to approve as a working document, subject to continued discussion. Approved and seconded. There was consensus that this should be a public document. J. Boffman asked if the committee wanted an extract from the division reports similar the mid year implementation report. The members recommended that a summary be requested from each division head.

Approved as a working document, subject to continued discussion. Seconded.

3. Draft 2004-2005 Strategic Goals and Priorities.

- Item #1.a. J. Boffman explained that #1.a. was added by the Steering Committee to ensure that support services were included. Discussion followed and there was consensus to make the following change: Ensuring the primacy of and direct support for instruction and scholarship ~~through direct support for instruction~~—and through high quality infrastructure support services.
- Item #2 Title – One member of SMPAC requested that item #2 title be changed by replacing 'Organization' with 'Institution'. This recommendation was not approved.
- Item #2.a. – There was discussion regarding the use of the word 'collaborative' being redundant. No change.
- Item #2.b. It was noted that the goal to differentiate from other universities will be looked at in the visioning process.
- It was noted that SEC requested adding technology in #2. No change.
- It was noted that the committee would like to set broader and more general goals.

Approved with the change to #1.a. and the removal of the word 'Draft.' Seconded.

4. Strategic Planning development needs. There was support for the a recommendation to bring in an expert in strategic planning, possibly faculty from the College of Business, to review the process used this year and guide us in next year's activities to create the long term goals. It was suggested that this may be a good open forum for fall (September or October) for all the committees in strategic planning.

5. Duration of USGPC Membership appointment. Discussion followed regarding the current membership and appointments of the committee. It was suggested to add a faculty-at-large instead of seeking representation from all colleges. The recommendation will be forwarded to SPSC. F. Edmondson will talk to the Associated Students office regarding the search for a student.