

California State University, Stanislaus
University Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee
Meeting Notes
February 18, 2005

Present: J. Boffman, D. Dauwalder, D. Demetrulias, F. Edmondson, M. Estrella, K. Jasek-Rysdahl, E. Peterson, R. Pugh, J. King (recording)

1. Review of the SMPAC 2003/04 report and recommendations. (Handouts: SMPAC report cover memo and report, 2003/04 goals, priorities and key indicators, 2003/04 Logic Model, and a report of activities to achieve goals of 2003/04.) The committee reviewed and discussed the documents. There was consensus (motioned and seconded) to forward the packet on to the Steering Committee.

2. Design process for reporting 2004/05 progress on strategic goals and priorities (handout). J. Boffman explained that the draft template would help align the information provided in annual reports with the strategic goals and priorities. Each unit would be asked to summarize actions, measured outputs, reflective analysis and recommendations for improvement under each strategic priority they have addressed this year. Units will only be expected to report on areas they have addressed. The document is to be forwarded to the Provost and Institutional Research. J. Boffman also described recommendations for modification of the logic model for use during the 2004/05 review. A line-by-line review of the document followed. There was discussion regarding: 1) changing the title of "Logic Model" to "Assessment Matrix"; 2) eliminating the column with unit objectives; 3) including measures on line numbers 10, 11, 22, 30, 34, 38, 46, 47, 59, and 61; 4) adding a measure of student satisfaction and MA/Credential student completion rates. The recommendation will be forwarded to SMPAC for further consideration.

3. Schedule for the term. The following dates and times were selected for spring meetings: March 18, 4:00-5:00; April 18, 3:00-5:00; and May 2, 3:00-5:00.

4. Committee structure (handouts). J. Boffman distributed a draft plan to combine USGPC and SMPAC with supportive rationale and recommendations. Discussion followed regarding the restructuring plan and several ideas/suggestions were expressed. There was concurrence that the Provost, Vice Provost, and Speaker should remain on the goals committee, and that the charge of each committee should be determined before membership is decided. To address the issue of committees that are representative of the campus community, but too large to function, there was a suggestion to form subcommittees so that smaller groups can work on specific issues and come back to the larger group with their findings. There was a question raised regarding the group titled "Consultants to the Committee," with the suggestion to change the title to "Ex officio, non-voting."