CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN BERNARDINO

Strategic Planning Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 12, 2015
2:00 pm - 4:00 pm
AD-127

In Attendance:	Terry Rizzo (Co-Chair)	Beth Jaworski
	Samuel Sudhakar (Co-Chair)	Muriel Lopez-Wagner
	Monica Alejandre	Connie McReynolds
	Jonathan Anderson	Laurie Smith
	Sharon Brown-Welty (Skype)	Jeff Tan
	Kathy Ervin	Julie Lappin
	Matias Farre	

Discussion Items

A. Approval of Minutes
   Discussion: The minutes from the February 26, 2015 SPAC meeting were approved.

B. Updates from PDC
   Discussion: None

C. Town Hall Comments
   Discussion:
   • General thought was it went well and we received good feedback. The revised Vision Statement was well received. Overall, the constituents thought their opinions have been heard through this process and that they had many opportunities to participate. This Town Hall seemed to be the most engaged one yet.
   • We received some comments we were already aware of, but others were new.
   • The technology worked well, but next time keyboards will be available for typing. A screen placed so the speaker can see what slide is being shown would be helpful for future Town Hall meetings. The meeting was well organized.
   • Would have liked to see more people in attendance. There weren't very many faculty present, but there was an influx of staff and administrators. This was probably a function of the date and time it was held.

1

- Mission/Vision/Core Values was not mentioned, but the slides of the morphing of the Mission and Vision were effective and indicates we listened to our constituents. There wasn't much reporting on the second Goal, Faculty and Staff Success.
- Some commented that the Objectives were ones the campus is already doing and that they are assessing where we are, rather than setting a goal of where we want to go.
- Some tables focused on the wordsmithing, so they didn't have time to comment on the other Objectives. Some of the Student Success Objectives felt more like Strategies. There seemed to be a lack of focus on graduate students and student success. Student Success Objectives should focus more specifically on the vision for graduate programs.
- It was clear some commenters hadn't understood why we wrote what we did. The comment on using "university" vs "campus" was insightful.
- There was concern that we will lose adjunct and part-time faculty with the tenure track faculty density Objective in the Faculty and Staff Success Goal. There was a suggestion to remove the term "density." Can't increase tenure track faculty and keep the same amount of adjuncts; tenured faculty could be teaching very large classes. May want to discuss class size issue, but consider that class size and tenure track density are measuring two different things.
- Some of the Objectives seem to be Strategies, but the Working Groups had to get down into the Strategies to know where to go, so some Strategies are already done.

D. Discussion on Working Groups
   Discussion:
   - It continues to be of importance to dispel the rumor that the Strategic Plan is predetermined.
   - Some Working Groups are struggling and haven't had a chance yet to build those relationships that SPAC has with each other. For the next Strategic Planning process, it was suggested to have a faculty SPAC member on each WG.
   - We have 32 Objectives now and that is a lot to implement, so SPAC needs to consider this. The next five years will be a building block and the campus will need to develop a strategic and transparent allocation of resources.
   - Student Success: There appears to be a lot of Strategies included (Objectives 3, 4 and 8). Objective 5 is good, but should be cleaned up. Objective 2 seems to be more about the assessment versus supporting students. Students at the WG meetings articulated that their measures of success are different than ours; they consider success as more networking, additional internship opportunities, applied knowledge in the classroom, graduating on time, doing well in classes, and having a job after graduation. The Objectives are missing practical things that have relevance to student success. Assessments Objectives (2, 7, and 8) could be combined. One comment was made that they were hoping to see how the students contribute to a dynamic society, such as reducing student loans. Objective 6 seems to be thrown in and "program evaluation of graduate education" is unclear. This is the only mention of graduate education. High Impact Practices is not clearly understood and there was discussion around defining what they are rather than listing them out. One comment was made that High Impact

Practices are Strategies versus Objectives. We're already doing SOAR and freshman seminar (so we are only measuring where we are and we do not have something to aspire to).

- Faculty and Staff Success: Marisol Johnson is currently the staff co-chair. The Objectives should be more data driven. We should be intentional to recruit diverse faculty that represent the students we serve. Global is not mentioned at all and teaching is mentioned only once. Suggestions were made to combine the first and second Objectives, but also that we could combine the first three Objectives as they are looking at increasing support, funding, and recognition for research. The WG should consider class size. There was discussion around whether staff is adequately covered in Objective 4. A balanced work-life is not mentioned, including childcare, family leave in addition to FMLA, alternative work schedules, psychological counseling, etc., yet in the original data collection we heard about its importance. There is nothing on increasing staff and people of color. Meaningful opportunities is good and research-related activities is, to some extent, applicable to staff.

- Resources Sustainability and Expansion: Clarify what a nationally recognized private/public partnership is. The College of Extended Learning component needs to be parsed out with their Dean. Objective 2 could be clearer – what we want is increasing revenues from tuition and that isn't expressed well. International students also bring a great deal of diversity to campus life. CEL has a lot of international students, but CISP does as well. Some statistics seen indicated that we lag behind the total number of international students per campus. Non-resident means out-of-state students as well. When international students are brought in, there needs to be support services in place. Although we're capped on local students, we still take international students so how do we address that? In Objective 3, what does productivity mean and the philanthropic language needs to be clarified – an increase in the percentage of gift givers or the dollar amount? What is going to be the Strategy? Hire more development officers? Activities that lead to public-private partnerships will bring in donors to campus. The Alumni Association can help create those relationships. Objective 4 is good. Objective 5 should look at new and existing resources. Semester conversion is a factor, but we decided earlier in this process to put this aside. Objective 6 should define what process efficiency means. We thought that Objective 6 would have to come before Objective 5, but these Objectives are really two different things.

- Community Engagement and Partnerships: Objective 2 – the idea of obtaining recognition surfaced and there is some thought that the goal is to the change the RPT process to get more emphasis on community engagement. That is faculty senate's determination, but it has morphed into providing support for faculty and how to present their activities better. Objective 3 – collecting information and community-based research is good. Should be more of a focus on service learning and trying to define what that is. Objective 6 - public dialogue was part of what the community was interested in and we wanted the community coming to campus and it should be broader. The barriers to bringing the community onto campus include parking and transportation costs, with no other barriers mentioned. From this WG's meeting with Jolene, this iteration is going to be reorganized because RPT is more important than Objective 2 and Objective 1 needs to include action pieces. The dates listed may be postponed to later dates.

The Community wanted less communication and more action and not just change the perception that we're the #1 institution, but change reality.

- Identity: Some WG members have missed some of the meetings and they didn't understand how it all fit in, but they are all on the same page now. A baseline isn't established yet. Building an identity that celebrates the uniqueness of our university (vs campus) is a great comment.

Action: Ensure the WGs are aware SPAC may be consolidating their work.

E. Strategies and Next Steps

Discussion: Suggested the WGs start with the brief description, action and element, which can help point in the right direction. Go to models, intro/background and finish with contribution and objectives. Keep everything practical, realistic, and a gentle stretch and recognize that politics are going to occur when it comes to resources. SPAC needs to give thought to the Implementation Plan, which is the next step.

Action: Dominguez Hills' implementation plan is a good example to look at.

F. SPAC Schedule

Discussion: We had originally scheduled the Campus Forum for April 16th, but due to scheduling conflicts, we're scheduling it for April 15th from 3 – 4 pm. The final draft Strategies are due to SPAC on May 15th. The schedule for the Spring SPAC meetings is listed in the Agenda. It should be noted that the last few weeks of May have additional SPAC meetings scheduled to ensure we have a draft to President Morales on time.

G. Roundtable

No comments

H. Next Committee Meeting

Working Group meeting (March 20, 2 – 4 pm)
SPAC meeting (March 26, 2 – 4 pm in AD-127)