6.2-- Strategies A and B are both heavily dependent on how willing the CSU is to assist us in recruiting faculty to participate in FDRG and act as CORE. Until their participation is resolved, I'm not sure how this can be achieved. Perhaps a specific note needs to be added about working with the CSU Academic Senate to look at their qualifications for participants in C-ID work (encouraging the CSU to allow tenured faculty, lecturers, etc to participate in this process). Until they are more flexible in their requirements, and more responsive when the request comes in, I feel like we'll be stuck where we are for a while.

6.2--Strategy C. What types of responses are you expecting to hear? I'd imagine you would get very different ones from the different groups surveyed. AOs will likely say that the review system (including the website in general) is problematic, and that approval is confusing *(especially for AOEs). I have a feeling that Curriculum Chairs might say that the website needs updating (as some of the template dates do not look current-- even though they are). Faculty would likely have a positive view. I guess I wonder if there are predicted, known bottlenecks, and if you want to use these surveys to prove they are real? I'm afraid we might open a pandora's box, that we will not be able to fix. Perhaps we work from known complaints...or start with one group at a time....AOs will have the most complaints. Also, it would be terrific if we could really perfect what we are already doing before adding new stuff (see note at very end of this email about GE), and honestly, I think most AOs would agree. Until we can reign in the review time of descriptors to a reasonable amount of time (and perhaps that means revisiting that 45 day policy), we shouldn't be creating new initiatives.

6.2- Strategy D-- its the website. If the website was fully functionally, I think you would have less complaints from the above. A priority needs to be placed on website functionality before process is examined.

6.2 --Strategy E-- maybe reword to "significantly more lower division requirements". With this, it is the work with the UC, as well as other high unit majors, right? I would suggest that the C-ID curriculum chair be put in the lead category for this, and move the CTE C-ID curriculum chair to the support role, or remove altogether. These are transfer programs, and the curriculum director needs to be an integral piece of this.

6.3-- Strategy A-- add C-ID curriculum chair to support. As a a member of MCW, the C-ID curriculum chair will be involved in these discussions anyways. Plus, as the C-ID Advisory Chair, it is important that the C-ID curriculum chair is kept in the loop and can assist in making all aspects of C-ID more efficient.

These are lofty, and I don't see any reason why the C-ID focused goals cannot be met (dependent on the CSU, of course).
One thing I noticed was missing was the GE pattern-- Miguel had asked me about some advice about working on this (to ease GE articulation by using C-ID descriptors, is what I understood). I feel like that could cause a huge headache, and a whole new round of complaints from the AOs (why develop another version of the GE system, C-ID can't review courses quickly enough to make this a viable option, etc)...should that be listed, or not?

1. Consider the change to a five-year strategic plan instead of three-years. This seems to be a more widely used timeframe and we have a great deal we would like to accomplish. I prefer the five-year plan. The Executive Director is responsible for a lot – should we reconsider some of those designations?
2. Consider the synthesis of the new Goal 6 regarding C-ID. This was the recommendation at the last meeting but there were fewer notes. I am interested if this captured our discussion appropriately. I think it captures our discussion. I read it as promoting C-ID for course within the community colleges that are not transfer level.
3. Some of the ideas we captured seem more like actions than strategies or objectives. I tried to place them in the "Action" category so we don't lose them, but we may not want to list any resources or actions in the final document. Thoughts? "Action is good."

Strategic Plan 2018 Input

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Comment
1	1.1	B	Should we consider costs for a consultant to train Exec or Leg Action Committee on lobbying (to the extent that we can lobby)?
1	1.1	D	We should consider increasing next year's budget in this area if this is going to be a priority.
1	1.2	A	Resources here might include paying to bring in people to conduct these kind of breakouts since the goal is for Exec to be trained as well.
1	1.2	B	This one is not clear to me what we mean by "evaluating" the liaison role. Is this a performance evaluation?
1	1.2	C	Should this be under a different Goal. Perhaps Goal #3? To me, it doesn't seem uniquely connected to statewide advocacy and seems more aligned with empowerment.
2	2.1	B	This is a good one and it shows we are not just giving lip service to diversity. If we are willing to create events that are spaces for underserved populations, then we are truly committed to raising up historically underrepresented minority voices. Nice.
2	2.1	D	Strategy should be more specific to be clear that the "culture change" is around diversity and equality: "Engage local senates to ~~enable~~ promote culture change which empowers diverse faculty at the local level and identifies barriers to local participation by diverse faculty.
3	3.1	A	This is good, but will require more training and empowerment of Exec members to work directly with partners and not always go through an ED or Exec officer as a mediator or filter.
3	3.1	B	We won't know who the applicants are until the apply and we want to be involved as they prepare the grant. Language needs to read something like:

			When grant opportunities for system initiatives are released, immediately <u>communicate to the field how ASCCCC can support faculty and senates to apply</u> ~~contact applicants~~ and urge inclusion of the ASCCC in grant applications.
3	3.1	E	This seems very similar to Goal 1, 1.1D
4	4.1	B	This seems similar to goal 3, 3.1D
4			For this goal overall I think we need to create a mission statement to justify why local senate visits are important and necessary. Within that statement should be principles that determine when a visit is a good idea and who initiates a visit. I'm reluctant to have local senate visits just for the sake of visibility given our capacity. Even if the goal is recruitment, I think it would be helpful to write that down.
6	6.2	B	You might call out articulation officers especially
6	6.2	C	I would call out the C-ID website specifically
6	6.3	B	Revise: Expand the number of certificate and degree Model Curricula <u>for CTE fields</u>