



Professor Shifflett said that the forums would allow them to get cross-divisional/cross-unit discussion going. There will be four forums this year. Professor Shifflett said, "they will move from discussion about what is the strategic landscape at SJSU, down to the beginnings of a discussion about what performance indicators might look like at SJSU. "

Professor Shifflett said that if anyone wanted to know how the Senate collectively answered the questions asked at the Senate Forum, they could go to the website. Professor Shifflett said, the next move "is to have focus groups composed of everyone asked to evaluate each standard across campus. All four of these focus group meetings have to be done by March 2004."

Professor Shifflett said, "We have a functional web bulletin board that is up and running. There is a link from the public web site to the bulletin board." Professor Shifflett said, "There will also be a Student Affairs forum in December 2003." Professor Shifflett was asked by a member of the Executive Committee, whether it would be possible to have a student forum. Professor Shifflett said that she and AVP Cooper would consider having a student only forum in coordination with Student Life.

Professor Shifflett said, "Here is where we stand with regard to the three committees AVP Cooper mentioned earlier. The Prep Review Committee has the complete report structure in place, and the writers are set. The writers have already been in contact with each other, and have reviewed all the data. We've pulled out the information pertaining to standards 1,2,3, and 4, and the writers are ready to write.

The Portfolio Committee has the process and the writers established, and the web resources are in place in every case. The basic structure for the web site is done, but the content is still under development." Professor Shifflett announced that the web site would be completed by March, 2004. "We don't need it out to WASC until July, but we are trying to get it up by March," Professor Shifflett stated.

Professor Shifflett said, "The Educational Effectiveness Committee's process is outlined, and they have chosen a research model to try and get at educational effectiveness. What I mean by that is that they really are going to engage in research. They are going to do a cohort analysis; they are going to do a transcript analysis; they are going to pull together some freshman, transfer, and graduate students, and follow them from now until just before the EE report is due. They are going to have focus group discussions with them, and track them."

Professor Shifflett said, "The response to the previous review is up on the web site as of noon today. There is a summary and a supplemental report. However, anything that is in red isn't quite finished yet. The appendices are where the "raw data" is, and where the writers are drawing their information from."

2. Professor Shifflett said that they want to use the Executive Committee and Senate as a feedback tool when things come up. Senator Shifflett asked in what other ways the Executive Committee and Senate could be used. A member of the Executive Committee suggested making this an item on every Executive Committee agenda for update on a monthly basis. Another member suggested presenting the milestones. It was also suggested that the BAC members be updated routinely. Another member suggested that this was a way or vehicle for us to use to act on needed changes now.

3. Professor Shifflett said that the Question for Institutional Engagement before Executive Committee members today was a part of Standard 3. The question they chose for discussion is, "In what ways does SJSU align its fiscal, physical, and human resources to fulfill its mission, priorities, and educational objectives?" Professor Shifflett and AVP Cooper said they would be taking notes on what the Executive Committee members say.

A member stated that from the department level perspective, and this could be very different for each department, these three elements are all key to having an effective academic program. The member stated that there are times when the focus is only on the human resources element, but it is important to look at the priorities of these three elements. For instance, maybe you have the human resources, but you don't have the facility to offer the class in. Then you might not be able to hire the faculty member, because you need the funds to remodel the room, or you may have to take the money you would put into course sections, and put that into buying supplies. At the department level, it depends on our ability to manipulate those resources, and still have a quality program.

A member stated that the BAC is guided by alignment between the fiscal and the physical elements.

A member stated that in order to answer this question we need to first ask, "How well has the CSU aligned its resources to match the mission and priorities of this institution, because we don't operate as an independent entity. For instance, the unfunded mandates affect the alignment that is capable on the campus, i.e. if they don't give us enrollment growth money, or if they don't give us the building, and we have to self-fund peoplesoft, that is going to push us out of alignment. First we need to consider, "Are we well aligned within the CSU?" For instance, we have the largest Graduate program in the CSU, but aren't funded for it. We are totally out of alignment with how we are paid. This could lead you in a WASC realignment to consider stopping expensive programs, because you are only subsidized in certain areas. We need to consider whether we are well aligned, given the constraints we must operate within." AVP Cooper said it is interesting to think about how to present that issue in this self-study. AVP Cooper asked for suggestions on how this could be presented. Another member said that what the two previous members describe "was operating in a situation of constraints from above, and then imposing constraints below us. We could explain in the WASC self-study that this is the way that we do business here, and demonstrate it at each level. This would show how we try to operate within the constraints, and how poorly we are able to do it." AVP Cooper asked how we could show how we could do better in the things we do have control over on this campus from the President down. Another member suggested "showing where we are constrained, and then showing where we have been able to strategically get funding such as for the new library, Clark Hall, etc." A member suggested that it was "our obligation to try and educate those people who are providing those resources as to those things that we really do need." A member said that he/she had "no clue about the constraints that the other units on campus operate under, such as Student Services or FDO. Consequently, what happens on this campus is that we only look at what someone is not doing for us; we don't know what their constraints are." Another member said that "it was true that this information isn't trickled down to the employee level. We need more transparent budget information given."

A member stated that he/she "couldn't think of a university-wide matrix that collected all of these elements. We tend to do it in different areas such as the BAC, etc. However, on the physical side, the minor cap program makes an effort to try to connect the deferred maintenance process and the five-year capital plan. On the Human Resources side there is an effort to get job descriptions written for everyone, and an evaluation process in place. That is the beginning of an alignment process."

Another member said that in his/her division they are constantly "crunching the numbers and aligning the physical and fiscal areas. Also, we need to remember that 56% of our budget comes from the state, but 46% we earn through the foundation, auxiliaries, grants, and contracts, etc. There is a lot of our \$379 million that is brought in by people to realign some of the things we don't get paid for such as pre-college. A lot of the money for these programs comes from grants that faculty and staff bring into the institution that makes that difference. We need to separate to what degree is the alignment occurring on the state side, and what effort an enormous army of people on this campus goes to, to bring in that extra \$140+ million dollars a year that brings us back into center."

**A member said that the human resources are so small in his/her division, that "they never get past doing what are the practical necessities of operation, because the restraints and constraints are so numerous. This may be the reality of all public universities, and it is vastly different from private institutions."**

**A member said that it strikes him/her "that a whole lot of units on campus are involved in the planning process. One of the issues in planning is how do you evaluate your plans, and how well connected and integrated are the plans university-wide."**

**Professor Shifflett said, "San Bernadino had just completed a strategic planning process right before WASC came. They then used the WASC process to show how strategic planning shaped their campus since the last review. What they did was target 3 or 4 main university issues saying that "this is where we are going and this is what the plan is," and then roll out what that meant to the campus. They rolled it out in a way, that that decision being made then affected the funding for every program, venture, endeavor, etc., and it went down to the department level and affected the faculty hiring."**

**AVP Cooper said he "was wondering whether the view here is that emphasis should be made on making the process transparent, or whether it really is key to have both the process and the actual information, so that when we are talking about fiscal matters, we mean the actual dollars that get allocated."**