

First, Elaine Sundberg and Rose Bruce should be commended for putting together this thoughtful proposal for WASC. It clearly represents a huge amount of time and expertise on their part. I have a few comments that mostly represent what I feel are omissions in the proposal.

Alignment of Institutional Priorities with Mission (page 6)

As it is written, this is a good summation of where the campus currently stands in the planning process. However there is no mention of the Senate's Long Range Academic Plan (LRAP). However much we may discuss that this document is mis-named, the fact is that it exists and WASC has already criticized us for having a confusing culture of planning. We have not renamed it, nor begun the important process of sorting out how all the planning efforts on campus fit together. Just because we don't mention the LRAP in this document doesn't mean that WASC won't still be confused by it. Indeed, the planning going on around campus seems even more confusing to me today. How do the school and department planning processes fit with the University efforts? What is the status of the Academic Affairs Division planning? How will all this planning help us "Align Priorities with Mission" (I don't think this is as obvious as the provost makes it out to be)?

Fine—we are in the beginning stages of planning and can't be expected to have an organized integrated process just yet. Shouldn't we explicitly acknowledge the need for an integrated planning culture in an outcome? Currently, none of the Outcomes mention planning at all. I refer the ARSC to the Long Beach 'Policy on Strategic Planning' from May 2001.

Second, and I'm not sure exactly in what SubTheme this resides in, besides a brief statement of the growth this campus is facing, there is no mention in the document about the glaring need for a plan to deal with growth. How will this campus deal with the increase in our lower division and residential population? How will the growth change our character and our mission? Or rather, how will we manage growth so that it doesn't change our character and mission? This again, should be at least acknowledged in an outcome.

Finally, a typo...page 10, second paragraph describes "four" sub-themes, when there are really five.

Thank you for considering my comments,
Elaine McDonald,
Chair-Elect, Academic Senate