



Strategic Planning Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 25, 2014

9:00 am - 10:50 am

CE-260

In Attendance:

Terry Rizzo (Co-Chair)	Matias Farre
Sam Sudhakar (Co-Chair)	Jolene Koester (via telephone)
William Aguilar	Muriel Lopez-Wagner
Monica Alejandre	Jeff Tan
Jonathan Anderson	Julie Lappin
Sharon Brown-Welty (via Skype)	Connie McReynolds
Kathy Ervin	Laurie Smith

Discussion Items

A. Discussion with Jolene

Discussion:

- Was there a preference for articulating greatest need, planning assumptions, etc. before strategic priorities? Consultant's response: The order isn't as important as the result and it is an iterative process and not categorical. The draft strategic priorities you came up with are fairly sharp and are composed from listening to colleagues around campus.
- What is an example of a goal statement? Consultant's response: As a general example, a goal statement could be "CSUSB students will have the support necessary to be successful and graduate." The Working Group (WG) then looks at the goal statement and identifies the ways in which success will be measured, but there could be huge variability in how they decide to measure that (i.e. 300 new student organizations at end of planning life; 12 new student gathering spaces; all students receive advising from professional advisor; graduation rates for freshmen will increase by 12%; transfer students' graduation rate will improve by 10%). All of these would meet the goal statement, and they can be driven by additional research that the Research Subcommittee has looked at.
- Should there be single or multiple goal statements? Can the WG come up with one or more tools for measuring that goal statement? Consultant's response: One goal statement for each strategic priority created is advised because we want a final plan that is feasible. The WG would

come up with at least several objectives or desired outcomes that are measurable and verifiable.

- Besides the WG creating the objectives, does the WG articulate what types of things will be done to achieve those objectives? Consultant's response: After identifying the measurable/verifiable outcomes, the WG creates those specifics as well. In January, SPAC presents the drafts and SPAC receives feedback on those drafts. SPAC will make choices about whether we want to change anything and then will give the strategic priorities to the WG's (goal statements). The WG's begin to create outcomes and will complete those by March. SPAC takes these back to the campus community to get feedback. Between March and May, the WG's identifies the strategies/steps/broad actions that are going to be taken that will move the campus to a set of activities that will allow the campus to reach the outcomes.
- Please provide an example of a WG for the student component of the priorities, including its composition. Consultant's response: The WG's should be cross-divisional such as key individuals from Academic Affairs, faculty, students and IT. For each of the goals, we want to create an opportunity for multiple divisions to bring their perspective.
- How large are the WG's and who chairs them? Consultant's response: Some campuses have had a SPAC member chair the WG, but that will be additional work for SPAC. It is up to SPAC how we want to do it. Having more than 7 in a WG is not recommended. Balance the size of the WG with getting the right people and there is a tendency to add people to meet an imprecise standard of having everyone represented. It is important that SPAC should: get good people that are committed to working; have cross-divisional group composition so there is buy-in across the institution; and have less than 7 people per WG.
- How have other campuses handled the identification of the WG's? Consultant's response: Typically SPAC generates a list of individuals that you believe are good fits. Run the list by the VP if you want to pull someone out of the division, give courtesy checks to bosses, and the faculty have to be willing to be on the WG.
- Are community members on the WG's? Consultant's response: That is hard to do considering time commitments and other factors.
- To reiterate, we take the top strategic priorities and translate them into goal statements. The translation process seems fairly literal so basically we can add a few words to the priorities to create goals. Consultant's response: Some campuses choose to get more eloquent and it is based on SPAC's preferences. You can choose to narrow it if you want or reiterate the statement.
- At which point in this process will responsibility on the specific objectives be assigned? Consultant's response: After the Plan is finalized, the President will move to the implementation stage and for each of the strategies and broad programs being recommended, the institution will assign an administrator responsibility, who brings in relevant consulting groups and parties to get the work done. There is variability though in how it is done; one campus is using a matrix-like approach with the administrator responsible for specific strategies with one faculty lead who is paired with administrator to assure the appropriate consultation

and faculty voice is heard. Fullerton and Dominguez Hill's implementation plans are good examples to review.

- Should the driving forces, greatest strength, threats, etc., be developed prior to January? Also, conceptually these would be used by the WG's as they develop the measurable objectives? Consultant's response: Yes, they should be developed prior to January and the Research Subcommittee should do this. The driving forces in California include uncertainty about state support for higher education, and in the Inland Empire, there is continued growth and demographics shift. Correct, these are used by the WG's to develop the objectives.
- Please clarify the points of distinction. Consultant's response: It may be something such as when the community group talked about the two colleges that stand out, the Colleges of Education and Business, the physical beauty in our campus, or our rankings.
- To clarify, we could divide up the goals, write up the goal, and include the greatest strength, promise, points of distinction, including the 5-6 factors? Consultant's response: That is a good way to do it, but make sure there is consensus among SPAC that something wasn't missed. Also, you will have an opportunity at the January Town Hall to present this and you will get feedback on it.
- Have you seen anything addressing the issue of the diminishing number of men attending college? Consultant's response: It is identified as being a problem, but rarely see it being addressed. We could have a goal, for example, that addresses increasing the percentage of men in college to 50%, but Prop 209 could be an issue.
- Is it reasonable for the Research Subcommittee to come up with answers before we leave for the holidays? Consultant's response: Yes. The Research Subcommittee should have most answers by January. The answers are reasoned thoughts and we don't want to publish a research paper.
- How should we collect data at the January Town Hall? We were considering each table having a transcriber and Titan Pad and they collect the ideas of the group at the table, with the feedback displayed on the screen for the audience to view. Consultant's response: Collect data in whatever form you want, electronically, paper forms, etc. SPAC will present the draft mission, vision/values, draft strategic priorities/goals, driving forces/areas of strength and SPAC wants to have reactions and suggestions from the campus community.
- What type of questions do you ask at the second Town Hall? Consultant's response: Very general questions have been asked in the past, such as whether the Statements are clear, and what is missing that needs to be there.

Action: we should outline responsibilities for the WG's and what we expect so each WG gives us the same data set around a framework.

B. Mission and Vision Statements, Core Values

Discussion:

- Draft Mission Statement –We received an anonymous Mission Statement that was linked with the ILO's, which was shared with Jodie Ullman and the Provost. Elements from this Statement were incorporated into ours. We're including scholarly activities in the draft, which mimics the

FAM document. Incorporating the changes from today, the Draft Mission Statement is final and will be presented to the campus community at the January Town Hall. Our final draft text is: "With a culture of inclusivity and collegiality, and as a minority serving institution, the mission of CSUSB is to ensure student learning and success; to conduct research, scholarly, and creative activities and to be actively engaged in the well-being of our communities. We pursue our mission while cultivating the personal, ethical, and intellectual development of our students, faculty and staff."

- "Another Opportunity" survey data is voluminous. Although there was concern that the data wasn't systematically categorized, the data is being reviewed and anything that does not fit into one of the five categories is being noted. The Working Groups will be given access to the data because it is rich. Because of the workload, the data from this survey will be divided up with other SPAC members.
- Draft Vision Statement – It is more student-focused, with not much mention of community. We do not want to offer multiple versions. We will receive feedback at the Campus Forum. Our final draft version is: "CSUSB will be a premier comprehensive university of choice for students."
- Draft Core Values – SPAC members viewed University of Vermont's values and Jonathan and Sharon were tasked with creating descriptions for each draft Value. It was suggested, and agreed upon by SPAC, that two Values (fairness & equity and inclusivity) collapse in with others so there are 8 draft Core Values (Learning; Inclusivity & Diversity; Social Justice, Fairness & Equity; Transparency; Respect; Integrity; Sustainability; and Wellness & Safety).
- Strategic Priorities – It was suggested that branding be incorporated into community engagement. Other SPAC members thought they're different and the data indicated that they wanted cohesiveness and an environment that they experience on a day-to-day basis. Another suggestion was made that we combine student success with faculty and staff success, but it was determined that combining them would make the respective objectives unmanageable because student success is so important and encompassing. Also, student success is tied to the ILO's and focused on learning, while faculty success is focused on research, and staff success is based on professional development. Our final draft Priorities are: Student Success; Faculty & Staff Success; Resource Sustainability & Growth; Community Engagement; and Identity. A suggestion was made to wait for feedback from the Campus Forum before assignments to SPAC are made. The Strategic Priorities are assigned to different SPAC members.

Action:

- The "Another Opportunity" survey data are assigned to the following SPAC members:

Question 1 - Laurie	Question 5 - Matias
Question 2 - Jeff	Question 6 - Sam
Question 3 - William	Question 7 - Sam
Question 4 - Monica	
- The draft Strategic Priorities are assigned to the following SPAC members:

Student Success – William, Terry, Sharon & Alfredo

Faculty/Staff Success – Jeff & Matias

Resource Sustainability & Growth – Connie, Sam & Laurie

Community Engagement – Kathy & Jonathan

Identity – Monica, Sharon & Beth

C. Next Quarter's SPAC Meetings

Discussion: SPAC meetings will be set up for Winter quarter.

Action: Please utilize the Doodle poll to indicate your availability for next quarter.

D. Next Committee Meeting

Monday, December 1, time TBD, to discuss the presentation for the Campus Forum

Friday, December 12 from 1:00 – 3:00 pm is the last SPAC meeting of Fall