

**Academic Affairs Strategic Planning
Community Meeting
November 7, 2003**

Weaknesses

Curriculum

1. Disproportionate effect of lack of funding to new faculty for research, professional development (w/ regard to RTP process)
2. Funding for graduate education
3. Special session programs revenue direction
4. Manipulating the curriculum to reduce teaching load
5. No graduate division
6. "Turf War" over G.E.
7. Independent studies, thesis work is over workload
8. Lack of commitment to remediation
9. Not enough sections are offered for required courses
10. Too many programs, degrees; no reviews for reductions
11. Lack of commitment to core skills (i.e., writing)
12. Infrastructure planning driving curriculum planning
13. Students dissatisfaction with G.E. Program

Outside Relationship-Community

1. "Expensive" CSU – creating barriers to access for students

People

1. Lack of diversity of color in faculty, staff and students
2. Dissatisfied students of color
3. Disengagement due to perception of "more of the same"
4. Understaffed
5. Work-related injuries increasing amongst staff
6. Campus not culturally diverse
7. Beginning faculty salaries low in comparison to cost of living
8. Varying workloads for faculty from department to department
9. Low staff salaries relative to cost of living
10. Faculty workload
11. Too few opportunities for faculty to discuss research
12. Strained labor relations between management and staff
13. Lack of clear definition of workload for staff
14. Over-emphasis on student evaluations in the faculty evaluation process
15. Lack of funding for TAs and graduate assistants
16. Unwillingness for non-tenured faculty and staff to speak out

17. RTP – unnecessarily torturous process / unclear, disjunctive. Disconnect between what a document says and what it does
18. High percent of injuries is due to CMS, increased risk-management issues due to under-staffing
19. Animosity/distrust among some faculty toward collaboration; lack of participation due to this perception
20. Culture where receiving tenure is the zenith/peak
21. There exists a fundamental, philosophical difference of opinion with regard to how things should be done, where focuses should be
22. There's a perception that staff have no power at all (to make changes)
23. Employment insecurity for large portion of faculty
24. "Glass ceiling" for women in administration

Facilities

1. Increasing time spent with e-mail
2. Policies relating to catering, etc., make it difficult to host events
3. Limited Health Center services for increasing # of residential students
4. Under-prepared students
5. Major projects "announced" – limited collaboration between faculty and staff
6. Limited faculty training in IT
7. Parking fees increase, but no monitoring for parking
8. Public safety focus on dorms
9. Facilities – driven planning, not academically driven
10. Dirty, run-down classrooms (many) \approx 60 %
11. Enterprises are overpriced – value is on profit, not on serving the campus community
12. Unbalanced concentration on IT – structure vs. on use
13. High prices for services (phone, etc.)
14. Green Music Center – controversial, perceived as taking resources; lack of transparency

Support Items

1. Insensitive to English language learners' needs
2. High price of food on campus
3. PeopleSoft has doubled/tripled workload – reports not useful
4. Not enough support to academic affairs – \$ doesn't come proportionally
5. Lack of cultural sensitivity, problems with PeopleSoft meeting proper needs
6. Inadequate funding for PeopleSoft conversion
7. Little financial support for faculty research and travel
8. Lack of post-award grant support
9. Jr. and Sr. faculty don't have sufficient support for research
10. Lack of instructional support staff
11. Lack of activities for resident students
12. PeopleSoft has pushed workload down to departments
13. Inadequate wellness programs

14. Inadequate, unpredictable support for library
15. Support services within Academic Affairs are not adequately staffed
16. Increases in charge-backs to departments
17. IT is under-funded and therefore is limited in ability to provide more support and training to faculty and staff
18. CMS drives how we do our jobs
19. Lack of responsive business practices to serve low-income students
20. Students as “customers” or “clients”
21. Lack of support for unfunded mandates and good ideas – rear guard action by faculty and staff to protect current funding
22. Lack of cultural sensitivity (e.g., Latino students)
23. Inadequate funding for PeopleSoft implementation

Other

1. General under-funding leads to lack of opportunity
2. Lack of transparency
3. Misconceptions about workload amongst schools and program
4. “Small” university mentality leads to lack of innovation and growth
5. Research expectations grow, but support doesn’t
6. Cultural shift in CSU – teaching and research
7. Changes in undergraduate population forces change in curriculum
8. Students dissatisfaction with advising
9. Adversarial relationships between Academic Affairs and Administration
10. Under-prepared students
11. Attention to gay, lesbian, bi, and transgender issues
12. Reduced flow of indirect funds to faculty research – centralized grant operations
13. A student perception that:
 - i. Lack of student input in faculty evaluations (governance)
 - ii. Lack of collaboration between faculty and administration
14. Faculty and departments being “nickel and dimed;” fewer perks, more charges
15. Too many requests for individual considerations – inefficient
16. Faculty objections to advising students
17. Budget underlies frustration – faculty feel it doesn’t have to be this way
18. Salary inequity – A.A. vs. A.F.
19. Disproportionate amount of budget flows *away* from A.A.
20. Antagonisms exist across divisions
21. Some faculty feel this process of strategic planning is futile
22. Over-emphasis on one religion (Christianity)
23. Too much animosity/finger-pointing, it’s discouraging. Unwillingness in faculty to understand and accept the reality of the budget crisis