

2012

STRATEGIC PLAN SURVEY REPORT:
ASSESSING THE
2007-12 STRATEGIC PLAN

2011-12 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

VOX
VERITAS
VITA

MCMXLX

STANISLAUS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY STANISLAUS
PREPARED BY OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	5
STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP	5
METHODOLOGY	6
PARTICIPANTS	6
DATA COLLECTION	7
DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING	8
RESULTS	8
ACCOMPLISHMENTS	8
STRATEGIC PLANNING PRIORITY AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	9
Q3. "THINKING ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY AS A WHOLE, IN YOUR OPINION TO WHAT EXTENT IS EACH STRATEGIC PLANNING PRIORITY INTEGRATED WITH PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY?"	10
SPP 1.2:	10
SPP 1.3:	11
SPP 1.6:	11
SPP 2.1:	12
SPP 2.3:	12
SPP 2.4:	13
SPP 2.5:	13
RESOURCE ALIGNMENT AND DECISION-MAKING	14
APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTING PRIORITIES	14
SPP 1.2:	16
SPP 1.3:	16
SPP 1.6:	17
SPP 2.1:	17
SPP 2.3:	18
SPP 2.4:	18
SPP 2.5:	18
EVIDENCE THAT DESCRIBES IMPACT OR RESULTS	19
SPP 1.2	20
SPP 1.3	20
SPP 1.6	20
SPP 2.1	21
SPP 2.3	22
SPP 2.4	22
SPP 2.5	23
UNIVERSITY BENEFITED	23
CONCLUDING ITEM: WHAT CHALLENGES ARE AHEAD?	24
CONCLUDING ITEM: WHAT TO PRESERVE AT ALL COSTS?	25
CONCLUDING ITEM: WHAT KEY CHANGES TO SUGGEST FOR THE STRATEGIC PLAN?	26

DISCUSSION 28

REFERENCES..... 29

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 30

APPENDICES..... 31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In spring 2012, the California State University, Stanislaus (CSU Stanislaus) Office of Institutional Research (IR) served as survey administrators for the *Strategic Plan Survey*. Sponsored by the CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG), this survey was distributed to the university stakeholder community with the intention of gathering input regarding the full range of accomplishments and achievements of the Strategic Plan—*Framing the Future*—as well as the current status of activities and initiatives as a result of implementation of the Strategic Plan Priorities (SPP). Of interest was to gather information regarding the degree of program-level activity related to the SPP, to learn what new needs have arisen, and to learn what new challenges or barriers have arisen that have or may impede the successful accomplishment of the SPP. While the survey asked for information specific to each SPP that could potentially be used in the evaluation process, this summary provides a synthesis of findings; data to support the themes in this summary can be found in the body of the report.

The sampling frame for the survey was developed to include all members of the stakeholder community consisting of all full-time faculty, staff, and administrators across all divisions and organizational units of the University. A target population of 749 campus stakeholder community members was drawn for the survey. The result was a total return from 395 respondents: 164 (42%) faculty, 183 (46%) staff, and 48 (12%) administrators; yielding a 53 percent response rate.

A tremendous sense of commitment and dedication to program quality was revealed throughout the results of the survey; suggesting it is highly valued by CSU Stanislaus faculty, staff and administration alike. Qualitative data suggest that this terminology is also understood as: excellence in programs, strong programs, quality programs, and programs with academic value. Moreover, academic excellence was also a major theme throughout the survey with a number of comments on the subject of commitment to serving students, to supporting teaching and learning, and to all priorities that include student-centered engagement. Also, of those who responded to the survey, about one-third (37.1%) indicated “Well to Very well” that CSU Stanislaus is accomplishing its mission as envisioned in the Strategic Plan. Likewise, about one-third (38.2 %) of respondents “Agree to Strongly agree” that the University has benefited from the SPP.

Much was repeatedly mentioned about the budget impact on all SPP; comments show there is a greater concern with affordability and access as funding is declining. A number of remarks relating to the concern of the University’s ability to being able to provide basic services to students, funding the academic programs that bring students to our campus, and having the resources to provide a support network that will allow our student population to succeed were revealed throughout the results of the survey.

Qualitative data indicated that the Strategic Plan was not executed in cohesive and uniform fashion as originally envisioned, in that, some organizational units persisted in various implementation activities, while other units did not. Many respondents indicated that there is a need for more collaboration in its continued development as well as, stronger and persistent communication regarding implementation of the Strategic Plan Priorities. Furthermore, of the comments given, 22.8 percent indicated more collaboration with the campus stakeholder community regarding the Strategic Plan; since its adoption in 2007-08, there was no one office or unit charged with leading and coordinating the effort of communication and implementation. Moreover, many members of the stakeholder community expressed the impression that there was no formalized structure in place

that would take “soundings” of the progress and keep the SPP on the “front-burner.” Subsequently, this survey is the first effort to assess the impact of the Strategic Plan since its adoption.

Although the themes revealed throughout the survey resonated both favorable and unfavorable views and opinions, there was also a clear message that the Strategic Plan has merit and worthy of continued effort; that it should be built upon and not abandoned.

**STRATEGIC PLAN SURVEY REPORT:
ASSESSING THE 2007-08 STRATEGIC PLAN
STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP,
2011-12 SUMMARY REPORT**

INTRODUCTION

The California State University, Stanislaus (CSU Stanislaus) Strategic Plan—*Framing the Future*—was approved by the Academic Senate on April 24, 2007 and subsequently approved by the University President on May 22, 2007. The intent of the Strategic Plan was to encapsulate the development of the University’s mission, vision, and value statement over the past decade as well as to guide the University’s actions for the next five years (*see* Appendix A). The university community, including the college divisions, was expected to align their respective priorities and initiatives with those of the Strategic Plan (California State University Stanislaus, Strategic Planning Forum, 2007).

The Strategic Plan was comprised of twenty-six strategic actions or specific activities distributed across three broad key themes (California State University Stanislaus, Strategic Plan Working Group [SPWG], 2007). The specific set of activities was intended to be a deliberative process within and among administrative units and faculty governance. The key themes are as follows:

1. Student engagement, development, and student achievement
2. Support for teaching and learning, scholarship and service
3. The University and the community

Strategic Plan Working Group

In moving toward implementation of the Strategic Plan, under the leadership of the Provost, with direction and monitoring by the President and the President’s Executive Cabinet, a Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) was formed in November 2007. Recognizing the limitation of resources to engage in all activities, the SPWG sought input on prioritization and implementation from the campus stakeholder community. On November 20, 2007, a call was sent to the campus stakeholder community to seek input to the following question: “*Of the Strategic Plan’s twenty-six strategic actions, which should be among the first on which we concentrate as the plan is implemented?*”

What followed were deliberations by the Academic Senate (i.e., March 11, 2008), the SPWG (i.e., April 7, 2008 and April 24, 2008) and the President’s Executive Cabinet (i.e., April 24, 2008), that resulted in the President’s Executive Cabinet approving (i.e., April 25, 2008) the Strategic Plan Priorities (SPP) (*see* Appendix B).

The final SPPs of most immediate importance were adopted as follows:

- SPP 1.2:* Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.
- SPP 1.3:* Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University’s mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.
- SPP 1.6:* Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.

- SPP 2.1:* Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.
- SPP 2.3:* Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.
- SPP 2.4:* Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.
- SPP 2.5:* Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.

At the start of the fall 2010 semester, the SPWG was reconvened by the Provost to conceptualize how best to approach the assessment of evidence regarding progress toward achieving the intent of the SPP.¹

After considerable review during two meetings (i.e., October 6, 2010 and November 2, 2010), the SPWG recommended the development of a campus-wide assessment survey to be administered to all college divisions, including Academic and Student Affairs support units. The intended purpose of the survey was to assess the full-range of accomplishments and achievements, as well as the current status of activities and initiatives as a result of implementation of the strategic plan.

Furthermore, the survey would attempt to assess evidence that the activity or initiative was due to the SPP. The survey would also help to determine what, if any, new needs have arisen as well as any new challenges or barriers that have arisen which may impede the successful accomplishment of the SPP.

The SPWG was reconvened in March 2011 to continue work on the development of the survey², including drafting key questions and constructing the survey format. Based on input from the SPWG, the Office of Institutional Research developed and designed the web-based survey instrument using Qualtrics Survey Research Suite. In November 2011, the SPWG reviewed the survey, suggested changes and/or modifications for final production. During January 2012 the online survey was pre-tested. By February 2012 the *Strategic Plan Survey* was completed and ready to be launched. See Appendix C to view the final survey instrument.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

CSU Stanislaus stakeholder community consisting of all full-time faculty and staff, as well as administrators across all divisions and organizational units of the University were the primary target population for the survey. While it was acknowledged that many individuals may be recent or new employees having little to no knowledge or experience with the implementation of activities from

¹ Strategic Plan Working Group 2010: Dr. Steve Filling, Faculty representative recommended by the Committee on Committees; Dr. Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker of the Faculty; Dr. Koni Stone, Faculty representative recommended by the Committee on Committees. Mr. Ron Noble, Interim Vice President, Student Affairs/Dean of Students; Dr. Angel A. Sanchez, Director, Office of Institutional Research; Dr. James T. Strong, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs.

² Strategic Plan Working Group 2011: Dr. Kevin Jasek-Rysdahl, Faculty representative recommended by the Committee on Committees; Dr. Mark Grobner, Faculty representative recommended by the Committee on Committees; Dr. Koni Stone, Speaker of the Faculty; Dr. Suzanne Espinoza, Vice President, Enrollment Services and Student Affairs; Dr. Angel A. Sanchez, Director, Office of Institutional Research; Dr. James T. Strong, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs.

the 2007-08 Strategic Plan, it was determined in the interest of transparency and openness all campus personnel would be invited to participate in the survey. Thus, based on this directive, a target population of 749 campus employees was drawn for the survey.

Survey administration was initiated by a pre-survey announcement letter from the university President, Dr. Hamid Shirvani, (*see Appendix D*) on February 13, 2012 to the university stakeholder community. The survey launched on February 14, 2012 and ran through February 27, 2012, with three follow-up reminders sent to non-respondents (*see Appendix E*). The result was a total return from 395 respondents: 164 (42%) faculty, 183 (46%) staff, and 48 (12%) administrators; yielding a 53 percent³ response rate. Table 1 shows the number of respondents by primary role, college or division.

Table 1.
Respondent by Primary Role, College or Division.

	N	%
Staff	183	46.3
Faculty	164	41.5
Administrator	48	12.2
Business and Finance	61	15.4
CHSS	59	14.9
Academic Affairs	51	12.9
Enrollment & Student Affairs	46	11.6
CNS	38	9.6
COE	36	9.1
CHHS	25	6.3
CBA	19	4.8
COA	18	4.6
Faculty Affairs & Human Resources	17	4.3
OIT	15	3.8
University Advancement	6	1.5
Office of the President	4	1.0

Data Collection

The web-based survey included 12 question items consisting of a variety of fixed response, short-answer, and several open-ended questions that attempted to measure the range of activities as a result of implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Data were collected using Qualtrics Lab, Inc. web-based survey software, of the Qualtrics Research Suite (Qualtrics Labs Inc., Provo, UT). Based on statistics provided by the tool, most respondents took approximately 25 minutes to complete the survey. For quantitative analysis, the tool provided options to download responses from all question items as raw data in either numeric values (i.e., numeric file based on assigned codes) or as variable labels (i.e., text-based file based on the actual question item text) using a variety of file types including Excel and IBM® SPSS® Statistics (IBM Corp., Somers, NY). All open-ended text responses were collected as verbatim and subjected to qualitative content analysis.

³ The size of response is representative of the campus community at the 95% confidence level with a confidence interval of $\pm 3.4\%$.

Data Analysis and Reporting

Raw data from the files downloaded from Qualtrics were imported into IBM® SPSS® Statistics (IBM Corp., Somers, NY) as appropriate for quantitative study. All quantitative responses were analyzed by overall frequency counts and percentages as well as disaggregated by primary role. To provide results that are potentially useful in the planning process, efforts were needed to summarize individual open-ended text responses into categories. These responses were analyzed using IBM® SPSS® Text Analytics for Surveys (IBM Corp., Somers, NY), which utilizes language processing technology, to quantify text responses into a wide range of categories based on dominant themes. In some cases, responses were unique and were not easily related to the dominant themes; as a result each of the basic categories was carefully reviewed and analyzed to ensure responses were placed in the appropriate categorical description. Additional categories were added when responses contained off-hand comments not addressed in the survey.

This report is organized by question, reporting findings for each and showing data summaries. Tables are provided for questions that had quantitative responses to Likert-scale and ranking questions. Open-ended text question items are summarized with the most dominant themes along with a short sample of verbatim responses to better illustrate the range of responses and the trends identified during analysis. The quantity of responses precludes inclusion of sample responses for every theme in this report, but attempts have been made to ensure various viewpoints are represented and the major areas addressed. For reporting purposes, open-ended text responses that remark about a particular individual, that identify persons by name, or that contain inappropriate language were redacted.

RESULTS

It should be noted that many respondents did not express an opinion or expressed having insufficient experience or knowledge of the Strategic Plan to articulate a focused response to the survey. In fact, many respondents chose to skip through numerous question items and respond only to those items for which they had some familiarity. Of the 395 respondents to the survey, about one-third was consistent in skipping through question items or responded with “Not Applicable,” “No Comment,” or “No Opinion.” This response pattern was consistent throughout the survey. Therefore, in the tables to follow, summary statistics (i.e., count and percent) will be displayed only for those responding to each individual question item.

Accomplishments

In Table 2 of those who responded to this question item ($n = 267$), about one-third (37.1%) indicated “Well to Very well” that CSU Stanislaus is accomplishing its mission as envisioned in the Strategic Plan. The modal response, however at nearly half (49.4%) indicated “Somewhat,” while the remainder of respondents (13.5%) indicated a negative response by selecting, “Not well” with respect to how well CSU Stanislaus is accomplishing its mission as envisioned in the Strategic Plan.

Table 2.

How well do you think CSU Stanislaus is accomplishing its mission as envisioned in the Strategic Plan?

	N	%	Valid %
Not well	36	9.1	13.5
Somewhat	132	33.4	49.4
Well	92	23.3	34.5
Very well	7	1.8	2.6
Total Responding	267	67.6	100.0
Not applicable	20	5.1	
Missing, Skipped	108	27.3	
Total Missing	128	32.4	
Total All	395	100.0	

Strategic Planning Priority and Program Improvement

The following three question items were posed in a statement matrix format and are summarized in Table 3. By asking the question in slightly different ways, the matrices attempted to measure the importance of the SPP. These items employ a fixed-response format and Likert scale of 1= “Not well” to 4= “Very well.” Following the rating of each item, respondents had the option to include any open-ended comments.

- Question 3 (Q3) asked generally, *“Thinking about the University as a whole, in your opinion to what extent is each Strategic Planning Priority integrated with program improvement within the University?”* Respondents were to rate each of the seven SPPs on the 4-point rating scale.
- Question 4 (Q4) asked with somewhat more specificity, *“Within your specific area, to what extent is the Strategic Planning Priority integrated with program improvement?”*
- Question 5 (Q5) asked how valuable is the SPP, *“In your opinion, how valuable with regard to program improvement, have the Strategic Planning Priorities been to your specific area?”*

While the response ratings differ slightly, the patterns are very similar. The highest rating was for *SPP 2.5*: Q3 (55%), Q4 (51.3%), and Q5 (49.5%). The next highest rating was for *SPP 2.4*: Q3 (48.6%), Q4 (50.8), and Q5 (43%). The third highest rating was for *SPP 1.2*: Q3 (45.3%), Q4 (51.1%), Q5 (40.7%).⁴

Thus, as measured in Q3, Q4, and Q5, *SPP 2.5*, *SPP 2.4*, and *SPP 1.2*, appear to be much more salient to the campus community than the rest. Thus, these results might suggest the campus stakeholder community (i.e., those with knowledge and experience) was either more concerned or more actively involved in the implementation of these particular SPP than for the other priorities.

⁴ Cronbach’s Alpha revealed high internal consistency in the measures. A subsequent Factor Analysis (Principal Component) confirmed unidimensionality of these item scales in measuring the SPP (see Appendix F).

Table 3.

Strategic Planning Priority and Program Improvement as reflected in Q3, Q4, and Q5.

Strategic Plan Priority / Activity Areas	Q3. Thinking about the University as a whole, in your opinion to what extent is each Strategic Planning Priority integrated with program improvement within the University?		Q4. Within your specific area, to what extent is the Strategic Planning Priority integrated with program improvement?		Q5. In your opinion, how valuable with regard to program improvement, have the Strategic Planning Priorities been to your specific area?	
	Well / Very Well Integrated (N)	Well / Very Well Integrated (%)	Well / Very Well Integrated (N)	Well / Very Well Integrated (%)	Very Valuable/ Extremely Valuable (N)	Very Valuable/ Extremely Valuable (%)
SPP 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.	101	45.3	91	51.1	66	40.7
SPP 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.	55	24.9	66	37.5	58	35.6
SPP 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.	76	34.1	85	48.6	72	44.7
SPP 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.	73	32.4	63	35.4	62	38.5
SPP 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.	41	18.2	52	24.8	64	33.7
SPP 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.	108	48.6	92	50.8	71	43.0
SPP 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.	126	55.0	101	51.3	92	49.5

After rating each SPP, the respondent had the option to provide an open-ended comment. The following is a summary of comments for each SPP.

Q3. "Thinking about the University as a whole, in your opinion to what extent is each Strategic Planning Priority integrated with program improvement within the University?"

SPP 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.

Regardless of the SPP or the respondents' primary role (i.e., administrator, faculty, staff), the comments focused on the pressures due to budget cuts and resource reductions. The overriding theme in response to this question item is that the budget cuts have severely hampered this priority (i.e., SPP 1.2). Many respondents expressed that with the budget cuts, all of the SPP have suffered

and will continue to suffer. The belief is that many programs have made dramatic cuts in response to the budget pressures that students are having trouble getting into the classes they need, and that faculty workloads have increased dramatically. As illustrated by the following responses:

- *“In the current budget crisis, meeting the goals has been a challenge on all fronts. Not only are we struggling with cuts and losses of resources, faculty and administration have also had to tolerate increases in workload. This puts both in survival mode, which makes it difficult to be creative and innovative in regard to meeting the criteria in the Strategic Plan. Essentially, most of us are trying to manage damage control instead of integrating solutions.”*
- *“We have not consistently provided service to the students in this area. Our programs go underfunded and faculty workloads excessively impacted, so that specialized courses within majors must be dropped or rotated, while at the same time, students find it increasingly hard to get the G.E. classes they want and need.”*

SPP 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University’s mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.

Although various themes were expressed in response to this question item, one dominant theme pertains to the inability of the University to keep pace with student needs to support them in career placement upon graduation. Likewise, the attitude expressed was that the reduction of revenue has drastically reduced support for new program development; aside from a handful of self-supported programs, the University has done very little or nothing to promote new academic or student service programs.

An additional dominant theme revealed there is little support of the university's mission for teaching, and research and scholarship. Another set of comments refer to the University Extended Education (UEE), in that, the growth in UEE is stronger than that of stateside, and *“new programs that can generate revenue through UEE seem to be favored rather than whether they fit the mission.”* In addition, *“The current campus environment discourages development of new programs, except for professional preparation degrees.”*

SPP 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.

In regard to student advising, the comments centered on a few common themes such as the budget reductions and student advising. In spite of the budget reductions, student advising remains a strong commitment and practice of the University, including specialized programs who direct students in their academic and career endeavors (i.e. PACE, EOP, SSS, and AOS). The comments also note, however, that the condition of these programs could be better.

- *“Student advising can always be better. I think that the balance between faculty advising and the work of trained professional staff advising should change. There are many more tools to assist the student in doing a portion of self-advising.”*

There is expressed concern that advising seems to vary among the departments, that some departments do not issue holds on registration or advise students each year, that certain departments do excellent work, while other department do little, and that several students do not have an advisor or too many students remain unadvised regarding majors.

An additional theme emphasized, *“faculty advisors are mostly not up to par to advise students about graduation requirements, etc.”*, and faculty in departments where they are committed to advising that helps students, are likewise departments where faculty are compensated for their time and effort.

Overall, in light of budget reductions many of the opinions regarding faculty and student advising are expressed as *“an admirable job of this, even as resources are being removed from this effort.”* The following responses also illustrate this perception by saying,

- *“The Advising Office continues to offer services, but with reduced staffing. Faculty advising is negatively impacted by the greatly increased SFRs being experienced campus-wide, and I can't recall any workshops or other training opportunities for faculty and staff designed to improve student advising.”*
- *“...faculty/ departments are picking up the slack where there have been cuts to advising in MSR.”*

SPP 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.

Faculty is core in the University’s mission of teaching and research; as expected, comments related to faculty work and quality occurred throughout the survey response. However, because this question item focused more on the recruitment and retention of faculty the dominant theme expressed was regarding the impact of budget reductions on recruiting and retaining faculty; other common themes expressed include,

- *“Departments have been unable to recruit faculty and some great faculty are leaving for other institutions.”*
- *“We are not making efforts to retain the highly qualified faculty. We have in some cases, caused talented faculty to leave.”*
- *“Neither diversity nor engagement seems to relate to RPT as it is being operationalized by administration; so many of our best faculty (in these areas) are leaving.”*
- *“We are damaging our recruiting and retention processes by disregarding our documented RPT processes and by discounting many performance criteria replacing a broad evaluation scheme with a narrow focus on certain publication outcomes.”*
- *“Faculty in many departments do not reflect the diversity of our student population.”*
- *“Given the budget context, we are doing about as well as can be expected in terms of recruitment. Perhaps due to the stresses of increased demands, retention appears more problematic.”*

SPP 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University’s staff.

The theme identified in response to this SPP indicated there has been little or no support of professional development for staff to develop skills and grow in their professional roles.

- *“It feels like staff training and development has been compromised in this budget climate - staff have more limited funds for training purposes and less opportunity to leave to engage in this work. Their jobs are becoming more complex yet they're not fully supported for this work or for advancement.”*
- *“Since 2007, there have been travel freezes and other budgetary restraints that reduce the ability to professionally develop the staff.”*

Another predominant theme identified perceptions that staff are overworked and frequently moved around without any monetary recognition “...not a pay raise over the past 4 years.”

- *“Professional development opportunities are in decline, and funding for many such opportunities has switched from University to Department support (which, given departmental funding limits, means the opportunities have been eliminated).”*

The following comment illustrates yet another theme present in the responses to this question item,

- *“Based on my limited knowledge, when staff increase their skill base, they are ineligible for reclassification, so what is the point in them learning to do more?”*

SPP 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.

The perception regarding the University Library tended to be very favorable and in support of the Library, regardless of having been disproportionately harmed by recent budget decisions. In light of its reduction in resources, respondents commented that the role of the Library is changing and there is a need to review and consider the use of new information technologies. For others, the budget reductions have resulted in the increase of needing to seek alternatives to the University Library such as borrowing from other libraries. Even so, many stated that the “library does a lot with little support,” the “library does very well with available resources,” and the “library is doing the best it can in the face of budget cuts.”

Others expressed their thoughts regarding the University Library by stating,

- *“The library is doing a fantastic job with the limited resources they have, and they continue to expand the quality of their services. But, they are understaffed and underfunded, and junior faculty are particularly challenged to meet the on-the-floor demands of their position while also engaging in RSCA activities.”*
- *“The Library staff manages to perform quite well despite funding problems. However, we haven't made the sorts of improvements over the past several years that one might have hoped to see. For example, Science Citation Index and SSCI are still not available.”*

SPP 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.

The comments suggest a high value need for providing adequate technology. Issues are raised about the need to improve the technology throughout the entire University; in particular with regard to supporting faculty. Respondents tend to perceive that technology is not adequate or up-to-date at CSU Stanislaus and this is due much in part to how underfunded the University is in this regard.

- *“Faculty computers are OLD, we never know what software is available to us, nor are we advised when we can get upgrades. OIT has some secret server for storage of large files, but I don't know the details since it is not advertised. Some PT faculty have no computer provided at all, and yet we are supposed to take advantage of instructional technologies to manage more and more of everything bureaucratic. Watching the wheel spin has eaten up hundreds and hundreds of hours of my time.”*
- *“OIT needs to hold to the mission of this being a teaching university and involve faculty in the process of policy development and implementation.”*

- *“OIT has stopped funding faculty and staff computer replacement, which is ridiculous; some employees are now using computers that are 6-8 years old. Classroom technology has not kept pace with advances in the field. Many classrooms still lack data projectors, many projectors are so dim that room lights must be turned off (which interferes with student note-taking), and no classrooms have interactive whiteboards.”*
- *“We've made some progress here, but we need more instructional design help, more classroom technologies, better web-services, and more training for students on Blackboard, Moodle, and other programs used in courses (faculty are not necessarily prepared to teach this to their students, and at most campuses these are covered via OIT workshops).”*

Resource Alignment and Decision-Making

A question was posed as to whether or not departments or specific areas have a system for aligning resources with the Strategic Plan (Table 4). Of those responding, about one-third (34.6%) indicated “yes.” Furthermore, when asked how these decisions are made, the responses pointed to the administrative leadership and operational management as the decision-makers, including faculty and chair involvement in the decision-making process (Table 5).

Table 4.

Within your specific area, do you have a system for aligning resources with the current Strategic Plan?

	N	%
Yes	71	34.6
No	134	65.4
Total	205	100.0

Table 5.

How are these decisions made and by whom? (multiple response)

	N
Dean	16
Chair, Department	12
Management team	11
Faculty	13
Director	11
Dept. strategic planning process	9
VPs, Provost	7
Leadership	5
Dept. program coordinators	5
Administrators	3
Supervisors	2
Strategic Plan Not Useful/ No time to implement	13
Don't know/ No knowledge	15
Total	122

Approach to Implementing Priorities

In a follow-up open-ended question, respondents were asked to specify their approach to implementing the SPP (i.e., survey question item 8). Table 6 summarizes the responses into a set of response categories.

The overwhelming majority of respondents did not comment or chose to skip these questions completely, while approximately 10 to 25 percent of respondents provided a comment. Additionally,

two opposing sets of comments are evident across the responses. One set of comments focused on more positive ways the functioning of SPP activities were approached. Another set of comments focused more on the various negative aspects regarding the implementation of SPP activities.

Table 6.

Given your experience, please describe your specific area's approach for implementing the following Strategic Plan Priorities:

Strategic Planning Priority	Response Category	N	%
SPP 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.	Planning, assessment, and evaluation	21	5.0%
	General comments regarding negative functioning	14	3.4%
	Resource allocation and financial planning	12	2.9%
	Educational effectiveness	12	2.9%
	Student support	8	1.9%
	Communication and collaborative efforts	7	1.7%
	Maintaining academic standards	5	1.2%
	Shared governance	5	1.2%
	Faculty support	2	0.5%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	330	79.3%
SPP 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.	General comments regarding negative functioning	18	4.6%
	Program support	9	2.3%
	Communication and collaborative efforts	8	2.0%
	Resource allocations and financial planning	6	1.5%
	Planning, assessment, and evaluation	5	1.3%
	Educational effectiveness	3	0.8%
	Shared governance	2	0.5%
	Maintaining academic standards	1	0.3%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	343	86.8%
	SPP 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.	General comments regarding positive functioning	27
General comments regarding negative functioning		11	2.7%
Suggestions for improvement		10	2.5%
Communication and collaborative efforts		6	1.5%
Articulation of degree requirements		5	1.2%
Resource allocation		4	1.0%
Student support		4	1.0%
Planning, assessment, and evaluation		4	1.0%
Faculty role in advising		1	0.2%
No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant		335	82.3%
SPP 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.	General comments regarding negative functioning	21	5.3%
	Competitive recruitment	12	3.0%
	Suggestions for improvement	9	2.3%
	Faculty support or development opportunities	6	1.5%
	General comments regarding positive functioning	5	1.3%
	Communication and collaborative efforts	5	1.3%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	342	85.5%
	SPP 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.	General support for professional development	31
General comments regarding negative functioning		26	6.1%
Training opportunities		14	3.3%
Conference and workshop participation		11	2.6%
Resource allocations and financial planning		11	2.6%
Suggestions for improvement		8	1.9%
Recruit and retain qualified staff		4	0.9%
Maintain standards		1	0.2%
No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant		318	75.0%
SPP 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.		General comments regarding positive functioning	24
	Suggestions for improvement	10	2.5%
	General comments regarding negative functioning	8	2.0%
	Seek alternative solutions	3	0.8%
	Resource allocation and financial planning	1	0.3%
	Providing current and relevant technology	1	0.3%
No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	347	88.1%	
SPP 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.	General comments regarding positive functioning	16	4.0%
	General comments regarding negative functioning	12	3.0%
	Seeking assistance from OIT	9	2.3%
	Integrate technology	6	1.5%
	Suggestions for improvement	5	1.3%
	Finding alternative solutions to OIT	4	1.0%
	Resource allocation	3	0.8%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	342	86.1%

The following quotes are selected from the written responses to survey question item #8 (see Table 6).

SPP 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.

For SPP 1.2, of those who responded, the dominant theme pertained to planning, assessment and evaluation activities as the approach undertaken in implementing SPP 1.2, (5%). There were a few comments relating to the implementation process not functioning well or that the University lacked focus of resources to do any implementation well (3.4%). To help illustrate, examples of verbatim comments are given below:

- *“Chairs/directors meet several times a month, and include discussions about schedule planning, course offerings, enrollment caps, etc., that consider excellence in education as a priority. APR, new courses/programs, and decisions for hiring all address this.”*
- *“Communication with colleges and departments on a regular basis to address key concerns.”*
- *“Data driven assessment, reflection, goal setting, planning then implementing.”*
- *“Direct assessment of student learning is an ongoing activity that has led to curricular improvements.”*
- *“Our approach has been to struggle with the budget. In addition, we have been conducting outcomes assessment focusing on direct assessment at the department level in order to determine the quality of education students are receiving at all levels of education .We constantly assess and make changes based on need.”*
- *“We continually review the program for both UG and graduates.”*
- *“We continue to do assessment driven curriculum development and teaching.”*
- *“We do a lot of planning, discuss all policy and changes and accept advice.”*
- *“We fight to run one low enrolled class by offering some classes with caps above what we feel is appropriate.”*
- *“We have just undergone a national accreditation review, and this process has forced us to use data to improve our program.”*
- *“We have worked very hard to provide a competitive athletic program that teaches life lessons to our student-athletes, does well in the classroom, and contributes to our local community.”*

SPP 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University’s mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.

For SPP 1.3, a number of comments again stressed the problematic issues in implementation (4.6%).

- *“Continue to pursue funding support.”*
- *“Given the current severe budgetary constraints, I believe that it is imperative that we strengthen the programs currently in place, rather than gambling on new program development. Current programs represent years (often decades) of University investment and that investment should not be*

squandered. While a University must change with the times, as a liberal arts institution we must maintain the foundation on which the curriculum is built.”

- *“Intimately involved in program development by exploring possibilities recommended by faculty and community members, review assessments of student learning, etc.”*
- *“Stop new program implementation until base budget restored; those proposed bottom-up should not automatically go to UEE side.”*
- *“We have perforce not been in expansion mode recently, but we constantly assess and propose, poised to implement programs when the budgetary outlook improves.”*

SPP 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.

For SPP 1.6, the primary theme relates to the more positive aspects of work in the area of student advising (6.6%), while a few respondents commented more on the various negative aspects of the process (2.7%). This was followed by respondents who suggested communication and collaboration activities as approaches to implementation (1.5%).

- *“Advising worksheet, participation in NSO, mandatory advising meetings.”*
- *“All faculty and staff participate.”*
- *“All students are assigned to faculty advisors who meet with them as needed.”*
- *“One on one advising that includes richer interaction and clear expectations.”*
- *“Our advising is excellent; need to support a director of advising with assigned time.”*

SPP 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.

For SPP 2.1, the central theme was related to the negative functioning of activities (5.3%), while others commented about competitive faculty recruitment activities (3%). Moreover, other respondents indicated faculty support and development as the approach undertaken (1.5%). Additionally, there were several suggestions for improvement, including:

- *“All of our desired TT positions in the past two years have been cut.”*
- *“Given budget shortages, we basically are not hiring new faculty. We are at risk of losing good faculty.”*
- *“RPT decisions are not conducive to retaining faculty, workload too high.”*
- *“The faculty is the backbone of the institution and, in the face of severe budget cuts and escalating conflict between members of the faculty and administration, CSU Stanislaus has lost a number of outstanding faculty members, many of whom greatly increased the diversity of the faculty while in residence. While the budgetary concerns are likely to persist, the divisive climate must be remedied if the University is to retain the outstanding faculty members it has and attract new colleagues.”*
- *“This is extremely important because CSUS needs to reflect the communities it serves. Also, diversity makes this campus unique and distinguished academically.”*
- *“Work with faculty (departments, colleges) to locate and hire diverse, qualified, engaged faculty.”*

SPP 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.

The majority of responses to SPP 2.3 were regarding professional development activities (7.3%); training opportunities (3.3%); conference and workshop activities (2.6%). However, there also were a number of comments regarding the negative functioning of activities where improvement is necessary to achieve the Strategic Plan.

- *“Allow staff time away from department to participate in continuing education workshops.”*
- *“Allow time to attend classes.”*
- *“As funding permits, support staff development through conference and workshop attendance.”*
- *“Staff needs to be recognized for the constantly changing environment we work under. Training is very important.”*

SPP 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.

While a few suggestions for improvement (2.5%) were offered by respondents with regard to SPP 2.4, the majority of comments were very supportive of the Library's various capacities (6.1%).

- *“Budget cuts have forced the library to reduce subscriptions; however, the purchase of electronic resources is on the increase; therefore, more resources than ever are available to the campus community.”*
- *“Continue financial assistant to the library--librarians do a fine job supporting academic affairs.”*
- *“CSUS has great resources to help faculty and students doing research and studies. More online resources or database are needed in some academic areas. For instance, K-12 education, special education, educational policy, etc.”*
- *“The Library has been doing an excellent job. Each discipline in the CBA has obtained library subscriptions to essential journals, books, and reference materials. Currently, the CBA is studying the possibility of subscribing to the real-time data of companies.”*
- *“The library is a very useful tool for our department and needs more support.”*
- *“The library provides excellent resources for the students and academics in my specific area.”*

SPP 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.

For SPP 2.5, many of the responses were polarized with either positive (4%) or negative (3%) comments regarding the functioning of activities to maintain technology support for faculty instruction and research purposes.

- *“Again, the budget cuts have had a strong, measurable, negative impact on campus technology. During my time on campus I know of no one who has received a replacement computer through funded depreciation. I use personal funds to buy the computing and other equipment (including a notebook computer and multiple external hard drives) I need for teaching and research.”*
- *“Budget restrictions prevent software and hardware purchases.”*

- *“While we greatly appreciate and rely on OIT's work in many areas, we know their fluctuating budgets are one factor limiting campus adoption of new technologies. In particular, the fluctuating web support infrastructure on campus (personnel changing from OIT, a private company, Communications/OIT, Communications only, and now?) has reinforced our preference to maintain and expand on our personnel and services in this area.”*

Evidence that Describes Impact or Results

Survey question item #9 asked respondents to describe the type of evidence or data gathered that demonstrates impact or results of implementation of the SPP. The results of the open-ended responses are summarized in Table 7.

As in the previous Table 6, note here the number of “No comments” to this question item. More than 90 percent of respondents chose to skip or not comment on this item resulting in very few responses offered for each of the SPPs. Many of those offering a response tended to mention, “Planning, assessment, and evaluation data” as the primary source of information regarding evidence of impact or results.

Table 7.

Given your experience, what evidence or data has your specific area gathered that describes impact or results.

Strategic Planning Priority	Response Category	N	%
SPP 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.	Planning, assessment, and evaluation data	28	7.1%
	General comments regarding negative evidence	6	1.5%
	Program impact	1	0.3%
	Resource alternatives	1	0.3%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	359	90.9%
SPP 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.	Planning, assessment, and evaluation data	12	3.0%
	General comments regarding negative evidence	5	1.3%
	Program/ Course development	3	0.8%
	Educational effectiveness	1	0.3%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	374	94.7%
SPP 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.	Planning, assessment, and evaluation data	16	4.1%
	Effective processes and policy	9	2.3%
	General comments regarding positive functioning	4	1.0%
	General comments regarding negative functioning	3	0.8%
	Required advising	3	0.8%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	360	91.1%
SPP 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.	Recruitment	6	1.5%
	General comments regarding negative evidence	5	1.3%
	Planning, assessment, and evaluation data	4	1.0%
	Retention	3	0.8%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	377	95.4%
SPP 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.	General comments regarding negative evidence	10	2.5%
	Support for professional development opportunities	8	2.0%
	Planning, assessment, and evaluation data	5	1.3%
	General comments regarding positive evidence	1	0.3%
	Suggestions for improvement	1	0.3%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	370	93.7%
SPP 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.	Planning, assessment, and evaluation data	9	2.3%
	General support for Library	3	0.8%
	Library services	2	0.5%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	381	96.5%
SPP 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.	Planning, assessment, and evaluation data	8	2.0%
	Technology (improvement/increase uses)	7	1.8%
	General support for OIT	1	0.3%
	No comment/ Skip/ Not relevant	379	95.9%

The following are examples of verbatim comments to survey question item #9 (see Table 7), which states, *“Given your experience, what evidence or data has your specific area gathered that describes impact or results.”*

SPP 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.

Of those offering a comment to *SPP 1.2*, the central theme was with regarding to planning, assessment, and evaluation activities (7.1%) as evidence of impact or results. Below are some of the verbatim comments to help illustrate.

- *“Because of NCATE accreditation, we have to gather much data (surveys, employer survey, signature assignments in courses, etc.)”*
- *“Data collected and analyzed for NCATE and CTC accreditation”*
- *“Due to the efforts towards AACSB re-accreditation, each program offered by the CBA has been undergoing assessment.”*
- *“Feedback from students in surveys, evaluations, conversations, and from alumni”*
- *“Tons of evidence based on fine-grained, repetitive, authentic, direct assessment of student work.”*
- *“We do regular course surveys and have a program evaluation system in place which is getting better run, but there is no time resource or clerical help to do much with it”*
- *“We have been assessing students in some of our major courses. Although classes vary, students continue to perform well in certain key pedagogical areas. For GE courses we are instituting assessment tools to assess learning outcomes.”*
- *“We regularly assess student achievement of our program learning outcomes, discuss as a faculty, and decide together what changes (if any) should be made in the curriculum.”*
- *“Yearly program assessment data.”*

SPP 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University’s mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.

The types of responses offered as evidence of impact or results for *SPP 1.3* were also in the area of planning, assessment, and evaluation activities. Some of the verbatim comments are as follows:

- *“Approvals of new programs, APRs and annual assessment activities can provide evidence.”*
- *“Evaluation of outreach programming, following provision of programming”*
- *“...we have adjusted our program based on student feedback from surveys and community input”*
- *“Students have presented at conferences and won awards”*

SPP 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.

Of those offering a response to *SPP 1.6*, the dominant theme continued to reveal a reliance on planning, assessment, and evaluation activities (4.1%) for providing support of impact or results. As evidence, many cited the Academic Program Review (APR) process as well as departmental faculty and student surveys to gather feedback.

- *“Bio dept. Has data and tracking system for number of majors advised individually by faculty each semester”*
- *“Created a student advising committee”*
- *“Develop mentor-mentee system in addition to the regular advising”*
- *“Every three years, we assess student satisfaction with our advising program.”*
- *“Have already been doing this for years, it's part of our accreditation and way of functioning”*
- *“Regular advising, with notes in each student's file”*
- *“Student & faculty surveys every semester”*
- *“Student contact logs, sign in sheets, and advisors' calendars.”*
- *“Student feedback and review of existing instruments”*
- *“Student self-report”*
- *“The credentials office has developed an extensive advising role.”*
- *“Updated advising sheets, department meetings to discuss newest changes and modifications, open dialogue with students.”*
- *“We created a handout for students to show them the required coursework so that students can make an informed decision in planning their own coursework.”*
- *“We put on advising holds. We clear them as we advise. We can keep track of how many majors received advising. Our advising form helps students to track their progress anytime.”*

SPP 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.

SPP 2.1 refers to the priority of recruiting and retaining a diverse and engaged faculty. There were very few comments offered for this question item. The overwhelming majority of respondents chose to skip this question item and offer no comment. Among the few that responded, the feeling of no support as well as overall concerns about this issue was evident.

- *“Absolutely no support at dean level or above”*
- *“The impact has been negative. There are important classes that have not been offered for many years.”*
- *“There are no data that I am aware of regarding our ability to recruit faculty, but I do know that we recently ignored applications from some very qualified professionals because of internal politics and jockeying for power within the department”*
- *“We are concerned about losing diverse and engaged faculty”*
- *“We have not done any recruitment since my arrival.”*
- *“We have not needed to hire in the past four years - but prior to that we were able to hire a very diverse faculty (equal male and female, and racial diverse faculty)”*

SPP 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.

Again the impact is mixed between those who cite evidence of a positive nature (1.3%), and those who cite other budgetary issues as reasons for no progress or evidence (2.5%). The following comments summarize the issues.

- *“As a result of this area's support for professional development and growth, we have experienced several staff who have completed bachelor degree programs through the campus career development plan. Additionally, system-wide financial trainings and internal cross trainings have given our staff opportunities to learn new skills, gain confidence, and create a career path within our area. Our area directly benefits from the newly acquired skills and growth of our staff.”*
- *“Due to budget; no results”*
- *“I am not aware of any intent in this department to develop staff. In fact, I believe money has been moved from staff to other areas.”*
- *“I personally have been turned down for seminars, licenses, and training to further my knowledge. I know of others with the same experience.”*
- *“Not nearly enough support”*
- *“Our list of annual goals and the completion of goals is our record of evidence; we also track all training for the entire campus (of those we know of), and have implemented the Campus Training and Professional Development website to guide all employees and supervisors in the required safety training and to offer professional development. The CMS MyCSUSTAN database contains the records of trainings as evidence of impact.”*
- *“Professional development just beginning; not sure how to use data for evidence in this area”*
- *“The impact has been negative. Our staff person is distracted by their unstable situation and may be hired away despite excellent performance.”*
- *“This is an on-going issue for staff that they don't feel supported and appreciated. Let's try promoting from within.”*
- *“Without the support of management the staff will continue to stagnate.”*

SPP 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.

Again, very few respondents offered comments in response to this question item, of those who did the comments were favorable towards engaging in planning, assessment, and evaluation activities that generate evidence or impact of the SPP (2.4%). Moreover, virtually all comments were favorable with regard to the Library as well as favorable to the importance of SPP 2.4 for instruction and for the University.

- *“Library APR”*
- *“Library survey”*
- *“On-going assessment efforts; surveys for students and faculty (working with IR)”*

- *“Part of our accreditation report”*
- *“Student course completion and graduation rates”*
- *“We gather quite a bit of data on the use of our services (online collections, library instruction and research consultation, database searching, etc.), as well as surveys of student use of and preferences for library services. We haven't been as successful in tying these data to specific outcomes (e.g. Student use of library services relating to GPA or graduation rate).”*

SPP 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.

While this priority was also cited as important for faculty teaching, research and student learning, the responses were few and very sparse regarding evidence of impact or results. More than 95 percent of respondents did not offer a comment or skipped the item altogether. Below are a few of the types of comments received.

- *“OIT survey”*
- *“Ongoing inventory of equipment”*
- *“Part of our accreditation report”*
- *“Surveys of faculty.”*
- *“Usage data”*
- *“We do not assess this area.”*
- *“We have usage data indicating that our online services are growing while other measures of library service (e.g. Use of printed materials) are declining. We haven't had the time to conduct more in-depth studies of how some of our other new technologies have impacted student access/use of our services.”*
- *“We rely upon OIT and FDC data for this.”*

University Benefited

The assessment of strategic planning activities is further measured by the question, *“Overall, has the University benefited from the Strategic Planning Priorities?”* that is displayed in Table 8. The results show about one-third (38.2 %) of respondents “Agree to Strongly agree” that the University has benefited from the SPP, while only 15.2 percent “Disagree” to “Strongly disagree.” The modal response, however, was 47.6 percent that responded neutral with “Neither agree nor disagree.”

Table 8.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement. "Overall, the University has benefited from the Strategic Planning Priorities."

	N	%
Strongly Disagree	12	6.3
Disagree	17	8.9
Neither agree nor disagree	91	47.6
Agree	62	32.5
Strongly agree	9	4.7
Total	191	100.0

Concluding Item: What Challenges are Ahead?

The survey concludes with several general open-ended questions. Respondents offered a wide-range of comments and opinions in response to "...*what would you say is the greatest single challenge CSU Stanislaus faces over the next five years.*" However, less than half of respondents ($n = 162$ cases) offered some type of response. The multiple responses ($n = 398$ responses) were analyzed and organized into the general themes and categories as shown in Table 9 (*see full verbatim responses in Appendix G*).

Table 9.

In your opinion, what would you say is the greatest single challenge facing CSU Stanislaus over the next five years?

Response Type from 162 Respondents	Responses	
	N	%*
Budget cuts, reduction in funding and resources	109	27.4%
Quality education/ Quality teaching/ Student-centered learning	58	14.6%
Leadership and administration	36	9.0%
Student engagement	33	8.3%
Recruiting and retaining quality/ diverse faculty and staff	29	7.3%
Academic integrity	24	6.0%
Maintain and develop academic programs	19	4.8%
Collaboration/ Support/ Working together	18	4.5%
Campus morale/ Campus environment	18	4.5%
Maintaining dedication to University Mission	18	4.5%
Maintaining quality services	17	4.3%
Fairness, Honesty, Respect	10	2.5%
Innovation/ Forward thinking/ New ideas	9	2.3%
Total Multiple Response	398	100.0%
No comment (Number & % respondents with no response)	233	59.0%

Note. *Column percentages are based on the total multiple responses (398) to the question. However, 233 or 59% of respondents did not offer any response.

Clearly the predominant theme refers to the impact of the budget. Slightly more than 27.4 percent of the comments and expressions related to challenges due to the reductions in funding and resources in executing the strategic plan and mission. Another theme revealed referred to maintaining quality education, quality teaching, and student-centered learning (14.6%); while yet another theme called out issues regarding the need for strong and focused leadership and administration (9%) as one of the greater challenges ahead.

The following responses taken verbatim illustrate these concerns:

- *“Financial resources. The limited resources we have had available in the past several years has adversely effected faculty, staff, students and in many respects the community. We are extremely challenged and often limited in our abilities to provide the exceptional service that we feel is one of the most critical roles we play on campus and in promoting the strategic plan.”*
- *“Maintaining quality education and services to increasing number of students with fewer staff and faculty will eventually result in student dissatisfaction. Once that happens, it takes years to recover and repair our image. We are no longer a small school since the student ratio to staff and faculty is so much greater than it was 5 years ago. You cannot continue to ask for more from your employees with fewer resources and expect to maintain the integrity of the degrees and programs offered here. One thing that students used to say to me all the time when I first started is how helpful and friendly and accessible everyone was. I don't hear that so much anymore.”*
- *“Continuing to maintain high quality education that serves some of the least well-prepared students in California in the face of falling budgets and an administration that has little regard for higher education teaching. The administration's single-minded emphasis on research in the RPT process gives faculty little incentive to participate in the many opportunities for professional development in teaching, special outreach programs for at-risk students, and ancillary functions like advising--none of which are given much weight in the RPT process. In an effort to make our institution 'larger and more mature,' the administration is currently neglecting all the things that have made CSU, Stanislaus an excellent teaching institution serving a poor, minority-dominated, and under-educated area of the state.”*
- *“Obviously the budget. The strategic plan could have a positive impact on CSU Stanislaus, but at a time when resources are dwindling, there isn't a lot either the faculty or administration can do to have a strong impact on the goals of the strategic plan. For example, how is a department supposed to maintain a diverse faculty when they have lost 30% of their faculty over the last 3 years and haven't been approved to hire? How are we supposed to even maintain the quality of education when many faculty have lost support they received for years and are pressured to raise course caps? Outside of the budget, the other problem is coordination. The university has always been structured in independent modules and integrating department plans with university plans (especially when conducting things like assessment) is difficult. The other problem is with the current lack of trust between administration and faculty. Even with strong leadership, in the last 5 years faculty have become increasingly distrustful of administration. This is obviously exacerbated by the fact that we now seem to have a rolling administrative staff. When CSU Stanislaus shifted from promoting internal faculty to hiring professional administrators it has become clear that we can't become too involved in any current movement on campus because the administrator who is pushing that agenda will very likely not be here in a year or two and our efforts will be wasted when another administrator comes in with their own (different) agenda.”*

Concluding Item: What to preserve at all costs?

As seen in Table 10, about one-third of respondents provided comments for this question item ($n=130$), while the overwhelming majority did not respond ($n=265$ cases, 67.1%).

Table 10.

In your opinion, what Strategic Plan Priority should CSU Stanislaus preserve at all costs?

Response Type from 130 Respondents	Responses	
	N	%*
Academic program quality	60	38.5%
Academic excellence	32	20.5%
Faculty/ Staff support	22	14.1%
Student support and services	13	8.3%
Unrelated remarks/ comments	13	8.3%
Student learning and success	11	7.1%
None/ Toss it	5	3.2%
Quality at reasonable price/ affordable/ accessible	6	3.8%
Total Multiple Response	156	100.0%
No comment (Number & % respondents with no response)	265	67.1%

Note. *Column percentages are based on the total multiple responses (156) to the question. However, 265 or 67.1% of respondents did not offer any response.

Of those offering ideas or comments, 38.5 percent commented on the need to preserve academic program quality, followed next by the need to preserve academic excellence (20.5%). The need to preserve faculty and staff support was also a primary type of response (14.1%). Some of the comments to illustrate these concerns are as follows:

- *“Providing the excellent undergraduate and graduate programs which would include supporting faculty and staff.”*
- *“SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. The students should come first.”*
- *“The college should preserve at all costs should be it's overall success of educating a diverse student body with a diverse faculty/ staff / administrators that are current with today's ever changing skills.”*
- *“Hispanic serving university, serving students and finding a balance in that to also protect burn out on the part of staff and faculty. An ethic of trust needs to be invigorated by central administration through inclusion of faculty as equal partners in decision making, not imposition. The strategic plan must include the morale and workload on campus because that morale is hurting the academic progress of both students and ability to teach by faculty.”*

Concluding Item: What key changes to suggest for the Strategic Plan?

Of the three concluding items, the following question elicited the fewest responses and comments. Table 11 displays that only 97 respondents provided some type of response; 298 cases or 70.8 percent of respondents did not offer any ideas or comments.

A frequent concern regarding the Strategic Plan is to involve more collaboration in its development and stronger, persistent communications regarding implementation. Of the comments given, 22.8 percent indicated more collaboration with the Strategic Plan; about 19 percent said “none” or “no changes” to the plan. Another 10.6 percent suggested there should be more focus on supporting quality programs.

Table 11.

If the Strategic Plan was to be updated, what key changes would you suggest?

Response Type from 97 Respondents	Responses	
	N	%*
More collaboration with Strategic Plan	28	22.8%
None / No changes	23	18.7%
Unrelated remarks/ comments	18	14.6%
Focus on quality programs	13	10.6%
Recruit, retain, and develop quality faculty and staff	10	8.1%
Better communication of Strategic Plan	8	6.5%
Realign Strategic Plan with University Mission	8	6.5%
Promote faculty research and scholarship	6	4.9%
Start over/ Completely revise/ Toss	6	4.9%
Include sustainable and renewable resources	3	2.4%
Total Multiple Response	123	100.0%
No comment (Number & % respondents with no response)	298	70.8%

Note. *Column percentages are based on the total multiple responses (123) to the question. However, 298 or 70.8% of respondents did not offer any response.

Of those responding to the question, many commented on concerns as follows:

- *“A focus on teaching and innovation with integrated campus relationships and services and programs that foster student engagement and student success.”*
- *“Emphasis on programs and services whose goal are to support faculty and staff whose work is clearly tied to providing students the tools they need to succeed. Financial Aid, Student Support Services, Grants, Library Services are all in need of additional assistance.”*
- *“That there would be a clear connection made between strategies for academic AND support services. I suggest that the implementation plan for the strategic priorities is almost more important than the strategies themselves. If there is no way to clearly implement the plans, then they are useless.”*
- *“Better integration with the community. Increase community understanding of what we do and why it is important. Focus research and scholarship locally as much as possible to benefit our community. For example, more open events on campus - one thought would be bringing appropriate faculty and community leaders together once a month to discuss current issues of local importance”*
- *“I believe many parts of the strategic plan are sound, but the specific focus metrics fail to advance the sound goals of the strategic plan. It truly seems as if several of the priorities were selected to prohibit progress as identified in the strategic plan. And indeed that is what has occurred in practice. In order to respond to these fundamental deficiencies and new strategic plan should emphasize the mission of the university. That mission focuses on societal advancement in our region by providing residents with a transformative and enabling education resource. Unfortunately the current implementation of our strategic plan was seemingly designed to protect internal special interest at the university. As such, benefits to the university’s mission have only been promoted when they happen to align with the self-concerned desires of internal special interests. This construct should be turned on its head and recognition of the university’s mission and purpose should be emphasized.”*

DISCUSSION

The results of the survey suggest that the University Strategic Plan Priorities were not implemented in a systematic way across all divisions and organizational units. Furthermore, in areas where there was activity, the results suggest a localized set of actions and disjointed activities. Qualitative data indicated that the Strategic Plan was not executed in cohesive and uniform fashion as originally envisioned, in that, some organizational units persisted in various implementation activities, while other units did not. Evidence from this survey revealed that programs with accreditation requirements tended to be the organizational units that drove the implementation of the SPP, but this was done in the interest of accreditation needs. The accreditation activities may be what have driven the formalization of program planning activities.

In addition to fulfilling various tasks and requirements of accreditation, the Academic Program Review and program assessment are other areas where activities related to the various SPPs may have been realized. However, these too, have been hit and miss, and have lacked the steady commitment of resources to execute consistently over the years.

The lack of evidence of activity may also be attributed to the environmental turbulence and instability on campus caused, in recent years, by the severe economic and budget reductions, as well as due to changes and turnover in leadership at the Dean's level and above. Simply put, since the Strategic Plan adoption in 2007-08, there was no one office or unit charged with leading and coordinating the effort of communication and Strategic Plan implementation. This also means there was no formalized structure in place that would take "soundings" of the progress and keep the SPP on the "front-burner."

This survey is the first effort to assess the impact of the Strategic Plan since its adoption. From those responding to the survey the results suggest a strong positive sentiment about the university mission. That is to say, while much was repeatedly mentioned about the budget impact on all priorities related to the Strategic Plan, there was also a clear message that the Strategic Plan has merit and worthy of continued effort; that it should be built upon and not abandoned.

REFERENCES

California State University Stanislaus, Strategic Planning Forum. (2007). *Strategic Plan: Framing the Future*. Retrieved from

<http://www.csustan.edu/StrategicPlanning/documents/StrategicPlan.pdf>

California State University Stanislaus, Strategic Plan Working Group [SPWG]. (2007). *Strategic Plan Implementation*. Retrieved from

<http://www.csustan.edu/StrategicPlanning/documents/StrategicPlanImplementation.pdf>

IBM Corporation (Version 19.0) [IBM SPSS Statistics]. Somers, NY, USA. © Copyright [2011] IBM Corporation. Property of SPSS Inc., an IBM company. © Copyright SPSS Inc., an IBM Company 2004, 2010. IBM and the IBM logo are trademarks of IBM Corporation, registered in many jurisdictions worldwide. SPSS is a trademark of SPSS Inc., an IBM Company, registered in many jurisdictions worldwide.

IBM Corporation (Version 4.0) [IBM SPSS Text Analytics for Surveys]. Somers, NY, USA. © Copyright [2011] IBM Corporation. Property of SPSS Inc., an IBM company. © Copyright SPSS Inc., an IBM Company 2004, 2010. IBM and the IBM logo are trademarks of IBM Corporation, registered in many jurisdictions worldwide. SPSS is a trademark of SPSS Inc., an IBM Company, registered in many jurisdictions worldwide.

Qualtrics Labs, Inc. (Version 2011) [Qualtrics Research Suite]. Provo, UT, USA. Copyright © [2011] Qualtrics Labs, Inc. Qualtrics and all other Qualtrics Labs, Inc. product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of Qualtrics Labs, Inc. <http://www.qualtrics.com>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Office of Institutional Research wishes to express sincere appreciation to the many people who have contributed to the development, analysis, and reporting of the *Strategic Plan Survey*. We sincerely acknowledge the following colleagues for their value and assistance in preparing and the editing this report: Dr. Angel A. Sanchez, Ms. Kelli Payne and Ms. Lisa Baysinger-Medina. A special thank you is extended to Ms. Kelli Payne and Ms. Lisa Baysinger-Medina for their contribution to the survey effort by preparing and managing this survey using Qualtrics Lab, Inc. web-based survey software, of the Qualtrics Research Suite (Qualtrics Labs Inc., Provo, UT), as well as by analysis and theme development of the qualitative data from open-ended question items using IBM® SPSS® Text Analytics for Surveys (IBM Corp., Somers, NY).

The authors greatly appreciate the members of the Strategic Plan Working Group, [SPWG, 2010: Provost Dr. James T. Strong, Dr. Steve Filling, Dr. Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Dr. Koni Stone, Mr. Ron Noble, and Dr. Angel A. Sanchez] and [SPWG 2011: Provost Dr. James T. Strong, Dr. Kevin Jasek-Rysdahl, Dr. Mark Grobner, Dr. Koni Stone, VP Dr. Suzanne Espinoza, Dr. Angel A. Sanchez] for their extended long-term commitment to this project, for suggestions and contributions to the survey as well as this publication, and for sharing their time and insight that have been essential to the ongoing strategic planning efforts.

To Survey Respondents

We appreciate the time and effort each respondent gave to complete this survey and your feedback will indeed influence the planning process. Further, the richness of the information will serve as a source for other efforts on campus.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
California State University, Stanislaus
STRATEGIC PLAN

FRAMING THE FUTURE

High Aspirations, High Expectations

Moving forward into the next decade, California State University, Stanislaus commits itself to an ambitious program: sustaining the qualities that have served us so well, while adapting to current challenges and preparing ourselves to grasp new opportunities. This Strategic Plan, *Framing the Future*, capitalizes on the development over the past decade of the University's mission and the vision and values statement, documents created through extensive intramural collaboration, and outlines a path for future development.

As a campus community, California State University, Stanislaus reaffirms and recommits itself to its core academic mission: the joy of teaching and learning. We commit ourselves to engaging and providing access to a diverse, often first-generation student body in a developing region. We commit ourselves to augmenting our strengths in teaching and learning by advancing support for scholarship and intellectual pursuits. At the same time, the opportunities and challenges provoked by the economic and social transformation of our traditional service region—the counties of Calaveras, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne—prompt us to augment these commitments by realizing our potential as an agent for positive change through partnership with the community.

This Strategic Plan frames our future through three key themes:

1. Student engagement, development, and student achievement
2. Support for teaching and learning, scholarship and service
3. The University and the community

Implementation of the Strategic Plan requires the necessary human, informational, technological, and material resources. We envision California State University, Stanislaus as a highly valued and respected institution that, endowed with a faculty known for the high caliber of their achievements, fulfills its primary mission of teaching excellence informed by well-recognized scholarly and creative accomplishment. Our aspiration is that the name "Stanislaus" be widely recognized as a place where academic excellence underscores teaching excellence.

CSU Stanislaus has built a solid foundation through planned growth, determined adherence to principles of collegial academic exploration, commitment to service to the region, and above all, to the idea that close collaboration between and among faculty and students creates engaged and responsive communities. In effecting the work of this transformation, our engagement with the community is invaluable to the success of any mission we envision. Our ties with our service area allow us to respond to the needs of the area and to work with our communities to have a transformative impact upon it. As we develop, we commit ourselves to serving the region; our fortunes depend upon our ethical, engaged, interpersonal activity.

This Plan encourages faculty development, innovation, and imagination to create and continue to deliver high quality academic programs. We will create a university culture that shows pride in the intellectual achievement and pedagogy of our faculty by investing in the recruitment and retention of a high quality and diverse professoriate and by supporting the development of individual faculty members. Similarly, organizational effectiveness depends upon the quality of the University staff members and their commitment to the highest level of delivery of services to students and faculty. Investment in the professional growth and achievement of staff is essential for the University to achieve excellence of operations and to fulfill its mission as a learning organization.

The University's organizational structures should reflect its high level of expectations for effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, accountability, and quality.

This Plan gives a framework and direction for program development during the next decade and establishes criteria for investing in its current programs. This Plan honors the University's traditional core commitment to liberal arts, complemented by professional programs in service to the region while encouraging a creative and innovative approach to program development. The University will continue to seek accreditation and reaccreditation by national professional accrediting agencies to underscore our commitment to quality.

California State University, Stanislaus earned the distinction of being noted a predominant Hispanic-serving university by U.S. News and World Report. Hispanic Outlook magazine designated our university exemplary in serving Hispanic students. We are listed as an Hispanic-serving institution by the U.S. Department of Education. Forty percent of newly admitted students are of Hispanic heritage. Attention to diversity is a hallmark of this university.

The University is committed to serving a growing freshman class; continuing to serve transfer, graduate, and post-baccalaureate students; and expanding opportunities for international students. We are one University with a commitment to access and quality at multiple sites: our main Turlock campus, the Stockton Center, the Merced Tri-College Center, and the expanded service area made possible by distance education and e-learning initiatives. As the reputation for quality education of California State University, Stanislaus increases, we will invigorate our relations with the many communities of our service area. The University will create partnerships with schools, foundations, and businesses to provide services designed to encourage college preparation and facilitate college entrance. The University will prepare its graduates to lead their communities, promoting student development in literacy and numeracy, communication, creativity, information competence, critical thinking skills, social and community engagement, and global awareness.

Building on our commitment to academic achievement, we are committed to ensuring that campus culture continues to support a nurturing environment, a vigorous student-life presence, and an aesthetically stimulating environment, the latter a distinguishing feature for the City of Turlock and the Central Valley. The City of Turlock occupies a special place in that service area as the home of the University; hence, we endeavor especially to build upon our relations with the City, as we grow our University with our home town.

Ours is a highly regarded Central Valley university with a vital mission. Let us frame our future.

1. Student engagement, development, and academic achievement

1.1 Strategic Action: Continue the tradition of engagement to enhance the overall success of a diverse body of students.

Activities:

- ❖ Continue to improve retention and persistence to degree;
- ❖ Increase student-faculty engagement through informal contact, service learning opportunities, meaningful co-curricular programming, community engagement, student participation in professional societies and activities, and study abroad;
- ❖ Encourage and celebrate scholarly achievement;
- ❖ Attract high achieving students to the campus and ensure continued access for students of promise by enhancing scholarships and financial aid.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ program specific retention and persistence studies;
- ❖ scholarship funding levels;
- ❖ student research productivity;

- ❖ student participation levels in programs;
- ❖ student satisfaction and engagement surveys;
- ❖ student demographics, including veterans and disabled students.

1.2 Strategic Action: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase support for current programs to promote excellence, as permitted by budget considerations;
- ❖ Increase degree to which programs are aligned with regional needs, student demand and institutional mission;
- ❖ Where befitting, sustain or enhance programs relevant to first year students;
- ❖ Enlist government and community support for existing programs.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ program quality (Academic Program Review);
- ❖ enrollment data;
- ❖ student, alumni, and faculty surveys.

1.3 Strategic Action: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.

Activities:

- ❖ Develop new programs through the department, college, and university structures;
- ❖ Engage in a highly consultative process to prioritize new directions with an academic master plan;
- ❖ Enlist the community to recommend and support new program development.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ program quality and vitality through academic program review, external evaluation, and disciplinary accreditation (as appropriate);
- ❖ enrollment data.

1.4 Strategic Action: Support colleges in developing and reinforcing their distinct academic identities.

Activities:

- ❖ Develop and articulate college identities;
- ❖ Offer innovative academic programs that both serve particular needs of the region and draw students from the state, nation, and internationally;
- ❖ Foster fair, effective, and efficient faculty governance structures that mesh well at department, college, and university levels;
- ❖ Diversify the colleges' resource base through acquisition of extramural and private financial support through University Advancement;
- ❖ Provide seed support for promising programmatic initiatives.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ colleges' public images in region, state, and nation;
- ❖ program enrollments—region, state, and nation;
- ❖ diversification of resource base and University Advancement support;
- ❖ programmatic initiatives.

1.5 Strategic Action: Facilitate access to programs and develop nontraditional delivery models appropriate for the unique needs of students.

Activities:

- ❖ Support new and restructured programs designed for judiciously chosen student constituencies, with specific program development emanating from the colleges;
- ❖ Increase number of certificate, credential, and executive programs;
- ❖ Increase number of students entering and completing these programs;
- ❖ Improve workforce placement in high demand professional areas.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ cost/benefit analysis, program evaluation, evidence of student learning, faculty and student satisfaction;
- ❖ enrollment data and program quality and vitality through academic program review, external evaluation, and disciplinary accreditation (as appropriate);
- ❖ program quality and continuing accreditation;
- ❖ placement data from business, education, healthcare, and industry.

1.6 Strategic Action: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.

Activities:

- ❖ Implement efficient, easily-understood and effective advising processes, including new student orientation;
- ❖ Make degree audits available on-line;
- ❖ Provide clear and accurate advising, accessible through multiple media;
- ❖ Increase student activity and accountability in evaluating their academic progress, managing their academic portfolios, and abiding by University regulations.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ retention and graduation data;
- ❖ appropriate measures, derived in part from data on graduation rates, total units attempted and time to degree;
- ❖ student satisfaction and engagement surveys;
- ❖ exit interviews.

1.7 Strategic Action: Emphasize internships, workshops, and career skills development to provide strong preparation for career success after graduation.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase opportunities for students to explore career opportunities;
- ❖ Link career options and opportunities to majors;
- ❖ Enhance level of service learning and community engagement;
- ❖ Increase placement rates in chosen field;
- ❖ Enhance the ability of California State University, Stanislaus students to perform as highly competitive and successful professionals.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ employer, alumni, and graduating senior surveys;
- ❖ placement rates;
- ❖ increase awareness and resources of Career Center;
- ❖ levels of participation in service learning community partnerships.

1.8 Strategic Action: Strengthen the general education program to prepare students for academic challenges, the likelihood of multiple careers, and lifelong learning.

Activities:

- ❖ Continue to evaluate general education course offerings and schedules;
- ❖ Coordinate interdisciplinary programs/intercollege programs both sustaining existing ones and creating new ones as necessary.
- ❖ Foster strengths in the liberal arts and preparing students for academic challenges
- ❖ Integrate clearly global learning and environmental sustainability principles into General Education Learning Goals;
- ❖ Assess the design and delivery of the general education program, including factors such as information literacy, global awareness, civic engagement, and sustainability, among others;
- ❖ Assess student achievement in general education learning goals;
- ❖ Enhance communication with California community colleges to improve transfer readiness and preparation;
- ❖ Study the feasibility of appointing a faculty director to provide leadership for development and assessment of the general education program.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ evidence of student achievement of general education learning goals;
- ❖ evidence of student participation in interdisciplinary programs or activities.
- ❖ graduating senior, employer, and alumni surveys.

1.9 Strategic Action: Prepare students to be leaders in their field who are globally aware and responsive to environmental and sustainability issues.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase percentage of students in leadership experiences;
- ❖ Integrate clearly global learning and environmental sustainability principles into General Education Learning Goals;
- ❖ Provide multiple opportunities for the study of a variety of languages and cultures;
- ❖ Increase the number of seminars, practica, and field experiences which address environmental and sustainability issues.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ student enrollment and participation in leadership programs;
- ❖ student recognition in campus, local, state, and national competitive leadership events;
- ❖ evidence of student achievement of General Education Learning Goals;
- ❖ growth of effective language learning opportunities;
- ❖ availability of campus and local seminars, practica, and field experiences addressing global awareness and/or environmental sustainability.

2. Support for teaching, learning, scholarship, and service

2.1 Strategic Action: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.

Activities:

- ❖ Continued university commitment to established principles of diversity;
- ❖ Fully implement the Workload Agreement;
- ❖ Implement and fully fund a policy of assigning twenty percent of total faculty workload to research, scholarship, or creative activities, broadly defined;
- ❖ Continue to increase faculty compensation throughout the academic ranks and at median level or above for comparable institutions;
- ❖ Reduce first year workload for new faculty hires;
- ❖ Support pedagogical development for junior faculty;
- ❖ Mentor and support research, scholarship, and creative activities agenda, including securing seed funding for extramural support;
- ❖ Promote and publicize accomplishments and achievements;

- ❖ Determine whether “increased college autonomy” means an increased level of participation of the college in retention, promotion, and tenure decisions;
- ❖ Mentor full-time and part-time faculty and increase opportunities for non-tenure-track faculty to participate in governance, service, scholarship and creative activity;
- ❖ Increase faculty opportunities to enhance teaching skills for advancement and professional development via the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning’s programs and activities.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ seventy-five percent tenured and tenure-track faculty, measured in terms of full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF);
- ❖ maintain or lower student faculty ratio;
- ❖ institutional data indicating the degree to which faculty are able to receive adequate assigned time for scholarship, professional activities, and indirect instruction.
- ❖ other faculty demographics;
- ❖ compensation data;
- ❖ retention rates at mid-career;
- ❖ faculty reports of teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and service performance;
- ❖ student and faculty surveys.

2.2 Strategic Action: Recognize faculty for leadership, service, and achievements.

Activities:

- ❖ Recognize and publicize faculty as public intellectuals;
- ❖ Increase level and variety of knowledge shared within the University and the broader community;
- ❖ Define opportunities for and promote involvement of Emeritus faculty in campus activities;
- ❖ Continue to improve competitiveness in salary compensation.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ faculty demographics;
- ❖ compensation data;
- ❖ faculty reports of teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and service performance;
- ❖ faculty participation in governance;
- ❖ faculty, student, and community surveys.

2.3 Strategic Action: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase staff opportunities to enhance skills for advancement and to acquire additional education;
- ❖ Enhance staff satisfaction and efficiency;
- ❖ Recruit, hire, and retain staff at appropriate levels.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ funding levels and hours dedicated for staff development;
- ❖ staff participation rates in on-campus and external staff development;
- ❖ staff promotions, re-classes, in-range advancements, etc.
- ❖ staff turnover rate
- ❖ staff educational attainment;
- ❖ staff demographics;
- ❖ staff, faculty, and student satisfaction surveys.

2.4 Strategic Action: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase substantially the size and currency of the library collection;
- ❖ Increase information and learning resources to facilitate high quality teaching and research, scholarship, and creative activities;
- ❖ Recruit library faculty and staff to appropriate levels;
- ❖ Increase support at the University level, in the colleges, and in the library for faculty pursuing grant and research opportunities.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ funding level for material and human resources;
- ❖ library user surveys;
- ❖ library unit review process;
- ❖ size, scope, currency, of the library collection;
- ❖ grant productivity measures.

2.5 Strategic Action: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.

Activities:

- ❖ Provide agile, robust, and ubiquitous technological services;
- ❖ Improve service delivery through accessibility and expanded communication;
- ❖ Improve faculty and student access to campus information and appropriate technology tools.
- ❖ Recruit technical staff in sufficient numbers and with appropriate skills;

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ technological support measures;
- ❖ technology assessment through support unit review process;
- ❖ faculty, staff, student satisfaction, and graduating seniors' surveys.

2.6 Strategic Action: Support innovative curricular and co-curricular opportunities to instill in students the pride of scholarship.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase availability of learning communities and learning support programs that support our student body;
- ❖ Develop programs and activities that help distinguish the University as a center for learning;
- ❖ Increase opportunities for student research, scholarly, and creative activities.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ retention of students and graduation rates against targets and in comparison with peer institutions;
- ❖ outcome achievements in organized learning communities;
- ❖ participation in honor societies, academic presentations, and competitions;
- ❖ students continuing to further graduate and post-baccalaureate study.

2.7 Strategic Action: Continue the development of the Stockton Center.

Activities:

- ❖ Promote existing strengths of the Stockton Center and enhance its academic identity by focusing on 6-8 complete and community-responsive programs;
- ❖ Provide effective, committed onsite leadership, instruction and staff;
- ❖ Redevelop business and academic master plans in collaboration with the community;
- ❖ Explore feasibility of alternative instruction and delivery systems;
- ❖ Develop key student services.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ stabilized enrollment growth pattern;
- ❖ increased faculty, staff, student, and community satisfaction;
- ❖ increased student achievement and satisfaction.

2.8 Strategic Action: Increase organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

Activities:

- ❖ Perform needs analysis of faculty governance at university and college levels.
- ❖ Consider proposals for restructuring of university governance and administrative organization;
- ❖ Support effective governance currently in place;
- ❖ Increase integrity of institutional data and data systems;
- ❖ Increase efficiency and effectiveness of administrative operations while maintaining quality;
- ❖ Improve enrollment management to streamline application and admission decisions.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ evidence-based decision making;
- ❖ campus-wide dissemination and application of policies and procedures;
- ❖ faculty, staff, and student satisfaction survey;
- ❖ functional benchmarking surveys;
- ❖ degree of compliance with external deadlines and requirements;
- ❖ cost comparisons with other similar institutions;
- ❖ operational improvement initiatives;
- ❖ use of qualitative and quantitative measures in evaluating administrator effectiveness.

3. The University and the Community

3.1 Strategic Action: Grow at a rate of 3% Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) per year, simultaneously improving instructional quality and fiscal well-being.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase student enrollments at an average annual rate of 5-7%;
- ❖ Maintain a student-faculty ratio at or below 18.5 :1 and increase instructional resources at a rate to match or exceed growth in FTES;
- ❖ Increase freshman enrollments;
- ❖ Increase classroom space;
- ❖ Utilize effective classroom scheduling;
- ❖ Develop program-specific community learning centers in carefully targeted areas;
- ❖ Increase number of qualified transfer students from Delta, Modesto, Merced, Columbia and other community colleges;
- ❖ Increase number of out-of-region, national, and international students;
- ❖ Increase use of national and international exchange programs to attract students;
- ❖ Increase percentage of regional high school students who go to college and select California State University, Stanislaus;
- ❖ Reevaluate systematically campus facility capacity needs.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ enrollment numbers and percentage of freshmen, transfer, graduate and international students annually against targeted growth rates;
- ❖ Stockton and distance education enrollments;
- ❖ international student enrollments and exchange agreements;
- ❖ percentage of regional high school graduates attending college and selecting California State University, Stanislaus;
- ❖ student-faculty ratio;
- ❖ university financial reports;
- ❖ classroom seat occupancy measures;
- ❖ need to reschedule classrooms after term begins;
- ❖ budget transparency with university financial reports available to the campus and wider community with on-line access.

3.2 Strategic Action: Expand high school and community college partnerships to increase the quality and diversity of our student body.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase quality and number of high school and community college outreach programs;
- ❖ Work within these partnerships to increase student preparation for college entry;
- ❖ Employ novel web technology and other well-suited communication strategies to provide prospective students with timely information facilitating college preparation.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ application yield and percentage of students in partnership programs;
- ❖ percentage of students requiring remediation at entrance;
- ❖ web users survey and web log analysis;
- ❖ percentage of students eligible for California State University, Stanislaus in the six-county area;
- ❖ local high school graduation index;
- ❖ number of local students attending California State University, Stanislaus.

3.3 Strategic Action: Implement an enrollment management plan to increase admission, retention, and progress to degree in graduate programs.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase enrollments in selected graduate programs to meet student, educational, and professional demand for qualified graduate students;
- ❖ Increase financial and scholarly support for graduate students;
- ❖ Develop new programs in response to workforce needs;
- ❖ Streamline admission process for graduate students.
- ❖ Consult fully with faculty and staff at the department, college and university levels as part of the enrollment management process.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ application yield, enrollments, and percentage of graduate to undergraduate students;
- ❖ mean application to admission time;
- ❖ retention, total units attempted, and mean time to degree data;
- ❖ academic program review.

3.4 Strategic Action: Maintain an aesthetically stimulating, inspiring and environmentally sensitive campus that supports opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and community members to engage and to give the campus a distinct identity.

Activities:

- ❖ Continuous development of campus climate and usability of grounds through campus master planning activities;

- ❖ Increase opportunities and reduce any obstacles for the campus and external community to use campus facilities and grounds for informal and formal activities, in accordance with university policies;
- ❖ Encourage increased usage of campus as a cultural and intellectual center;
- ❖ Make the arts more visible on campus (e.g. a public sculpture campaign);
- ❖ Establish a creative arts committee on campus;
- ❖ Coordinate art on campus initiatives, including building programs, with the College of the Arts.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ assess facility usage through support unit review process;
- ❖ completion of campus master planning;
- ❖ student satisfaction and engagement surveys;
- ❖ community surveys;
- ❖ number and types of events occurring on campus;
- ❖ revenue generated by non-university event rentals;
- ❖ customer satisfaction surveys;
- ❖ reviews of campus visual art and performance;
- ❖ quantity and quality of art on campus;
- ❖ use of sustainable technology and techniques.

3.5 Strategic Action: Create a vibrant campus student life culture through increased, high-quality residential living opportunities within the greater campus area.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase campus residential population through the construction of a variety of new student housing units;
- ❖ Enhance local student housing opportunities;
- ❖ Facilitate an invigorating, safe, and healthy campus life to enhance student experience;
- ❖ Improve food service, recreation and activities, safety service, and appropriate administrative service hours.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ housing, food service, sororities, fraternities, student activities, and other areas;
- ❖ occupancy reports for housing;
- ❖ campus crime statistics;
- ❖ appropriate benchmarking surveys related to student behavior, physical and mental health;
- ❖ student satisfaction and engagement surveys.

3.6 Strategic Action: Enhance our academic stature nationally and within the California State University system.

Activities:

- ❖ Achieve consistently the highest reaccreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and disciplinary accrediting agencies.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ Western Association of Schools and Colleges reaccreditation;
- ❖ disciplinary reaccreditations;
- ❖ National Ranking Publications (e.g., *Princeton Review* listing; *US News and World Report* listing; *Hispanic Outlook* listing);
- ❖ Offices held by faculty and administration in professional organizations;
- ❖ CSU Accountability Report and Chancellor's Office reports.

3.7 Strategic Action: Enhance our partnerships regionally, with special attention to the City of Turlock.

Activities:

- ❖ Substantially increase level of interaction with alumni;
- ❖ Position the University as a prominent and reliable intellectual resource for the service area;
- ❖ Develop partnerships and create a college town environment;
- ❖ Enhance relationships with government agencies and elected officials;
- ❖ Consider creating a Turlock downtown office and delivery site for extended education and degree programs;
- ❖ Increase quality of relations between the City of Turlock and the University;
- ❖ Increase service learning opportunities to enhance engagement between the campus and community.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ survey of alumni, employers, superintendents, and community college presidents;
- ❖ partnerships and philanthropic activities;
- ❖ student, staff, and faculty involvement in service activities;
- ❖ campus involvement in service learning and local community internships;
- ❖ extended education programs and enrollments;
- ❖ faculty and staff participation in city organizations;
- ❖ city participation in campus organizations.

3.8 Strategic Action: Enhance University contributions to the region's economic prosperity.

Activities:

- ❖ Increase opportunities for local economic and business development forums;
- ❖ Encourage responsible, ethical, and sustainable economic development;
- ❖ Increase opportunities for University researchers to improve regional understanding of economic and social indicators;
- ❖ Develop a knowledge-based research center focusing on land and environmental policy and planning;
- ❖ Explore opportunities for university-business cooperation;
- ❖ Establish University as a key regional source of talent for business recruitment.

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ number of events, activities, and studies for business and economic development;
- ❖ regional economic development indicators;
- ❖ surveys of economic development officers and leaders;
- ❖ alumni employment.

3.9 Strategic Action: Through Advertising, Enhance University Image and Public Relations

Activities:

- ❖ Increase the awareness of California State University, Stanislaus students as highly competitive and successful professionals.
- ❖ Employ novel web technology and recruiting materials to market the University.
- ❖ Increase perception of campus as a cultural and intellectual center.
- ❖ Market colleges' distinctiveness and competitive advantages through sophisticated and focused promotional materials;
- ❖ Enhance marketing and promotion of the Stockton Center;
- ❖ Update website and print media publicizing the university, its achievements and activities open to the public, such as plays, gallery openings and musical performances;

- ❖ Implement local marketing and communications plan;
- ❖ Improve signage and “faces” of University;
- ❖ Publicize the university through increased use of public radio, campus radio, television (including public television), and student newspaper;

Effectiveness Indicators:

- ❖ media coverage;
- ❖ foot traffic in University business area;
- ❖ alumni hiring data
- ❖ enrollment data
- ❖ number of cultural and intellectual events on campus

Implementation of the Strategic Plan

The Plan is organized into three themes each supported by several *Strategic Actions*, each of which is further supplemented by specific *Activities* and *Effectiveness Indicators*. The numerical order of these *Actions* and *Activities* is not meant to designate specific priority. Priority for actions and activities is an ongoing, deliberative process within and among administrative units and faculty governance. Hence, University and college divisions are expected to align their own priorities and initiatives with this Plan.

Effectiveness Indicators are to be taken as possible measures and are not inclusive. Actual indicators are chosen through collaborative consultation among those who perform the actions and activities and those responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the actions and activities, in accordance with the best practices and established principles of shared governance.

Surveys are frequently identified as effectiveness indicators throughout the document. It is not the intention to develop or conduct individual surveys for each indicator mentioned. Rather, the Office of Institutional Research coordinates the administration of surveys in order to combine measures so as to limit the total number of surveys employed and to use existing data and/or instruments wherever possible and appropriate. Also, in cases where it is determined that new survey instruments are needed, preference will be given to the possibility of employing the university's own faculty and/or staff to construct them.

The Plan guides the University's actions for the next five years. Implementation occurs under the leadership of the Provost, with direction and monitoring by the President and the President's Executive Cabinet, based upon assessment data provided by the Office of Institutional Research. The budgetary process ensures a direct link to the Plan and the allocation of revenue sources to support priorities. Campus leaders assess *Strategic Actions* in regular annual reporting documents. We recognize that the Plan must be dynamic and agile, with the University ready to move forcefully in directions not envisioned at the time of adoption, while preserving the effective strengths of the past. Through our commitment to these focused strategic actions and collegial processes, we ensure our future as an outstanding academic center.

Process and Participation in Developing the Strategic Plan

Building on a decade of success in strategic planning at California State University, Stanislaus, President Hamid Shirvani invited the campus community to move the University to the next level of accomplishment and excellence. A strategic planning forum assembled 28 faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community members for a two-day strategic planning session, February 2-3, 2006.

As a means to assess the University's current strategic position, the forum began with an examination of institutional research data, environmental scans, and college academic program plans, followed by a frank discussion of University's strengths and weaknesses, threats and opportunities. The focus then shifted to the future. A conceptual framework emerged from the

forum, a thematic unity that framed the future of California State University, Stanislaus in ways that preserve its traditions and essential character—an historic devotion to students through strong faculty-student interaction and engagement, access (especially for first generation students), regional service, and above all, a commitment to excellence in teaching and learning.

After the forum, a small writing group, comprised of faculty and administration, drafted a Plan consistent with the framework and actions identified during the strategic planning discussions. The Plan identified three institutional priorities, supported by 25 strategic actions and methods for demonstrating effectiveness and quality.

The draft Plan was presented to the campus for discussion in February 2006. Feedback from open forums, online discussions, and other venues was crucial in formulating the revised draft presented to the campus in mid-April 2006. This draft also was widely circulated, and discussed in Academic Senate, faculty governance committees, and administrative units. The present draft (October 2006) incorporates feedback from both of these cycles, and is hereby submitted for deliberation and endorsement by the Academic Senate and approval by the President.

Forum Participants

The following campus and community members participated in the strategic planning forum:

Bill Ahlem, Member, Foundation Board of Trustees
 June Boffman, Interim Dean, College of Arts Letters and Sciences
 Wanda Bonnell, Academic Advisor, Educational Opportunity Program
 David Dauwalder, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
 Scott Davis, Assistant Professor, Department of English
 Diana Demetrulias, Vice Provost
 Amin Elmallah, Dean, College of Business Administration
 Dianne Gagos, Vice President, Foundation Board of Trustees
 Randall Harris, Associate Professor, Management, Operations, and Marketing
 Jennifer Helzer, Associate Professor, Anthropology and Geography
 Kathleen Hidalgo, Administrative Support Coordinator, Advanced Studies in Education
 James Koelewyn, Consultant, Information Technology
 Andrew LaFlamme, Student, Vice President-External of the Associated Students, Inc.
 Timothy Mahoney, Assistant Professor, Teacher Education
 Ken McCall, Alumnus
 Chelsea Minor, Student, President of the Associated Students, Inc.
 Cynthia Morgan, Dean, Stockton Center
 Stacey Morgan-Foster, Vice President for Student Affairs
 Mildred Murray-Ward, Dean, College of Education
 Gary Novak, Professor, Psychology and Child Development
 Paul O'Brien, Professor and Chair, Sociology
 Al Petrosky, Speaker of the Faculty, Associate Professor, Management, Operations, and Marketing
 Roger Pugh, Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Management Services
 Bill Ruud, Vice President, Development and University Relations
 John Sarraillé, Professor, Computer Science
 Ham Shirvani, President
 Mary Stephens, Vice President, Business and Finance
 My Lo Thao, Assistant Professor, Biological Sciences

The Writing Group

June Boffman, Special Assistant to the Provost
 Scott Davis, Assistant Professor of English
 Diana Demetrulias, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
 Janet King, Special Assistant to the Provost

Stacey Morgan-Foster, Vice President for Student Affairs

Gary Novak, Professor of Psychology and Child Development and Interim Dean of the College of Human and Health Sciences

Acknowledgements

Special thanks are due to Professor Steven Filling for hosting the online threaded discussion, to Janet King and Jeanne Elliott for managing logistics, and to the many faculty, staff, students, alumni, and administrators who participated in the process, led discussion sessions in committee meetings and open forums, rendered articulate and forceful feedback, and submitted language to the writing group for consideration, especially Carl Bengston, Julie Fox, John Garcia, David Hamlett, Jennifer Helzer, Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Cynthia Morgan, Paul O'Brien, Elaine Peterson, Al Petrosky, Dawn Poole, Roger Pugh, Bill Ruud, Mary Stephens, Koni Stone, and Mark Thompson.

AS (4/24/07)

President approved 5/22/07

APPENDIX B

California State University, Stanislaus

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The Strategic Plan for California State University, Stanislaus—*Framing the Future* (approved by the Academic Senate on April 24, 2007 and by the President on May 22, 2007) capitalizes on the development over the past decade of the University's mission and the vision and values statement, documents created through extensive intramural collaboration, and outlines a path for future development.

The Strategic Plan is organized into three themes each supported by several *Strategic Actions*, each of which is further supplemented by specific *Activities* and *Effectiveness Indicators*. The numerical order of the *Actions* and *Activities* is not meant to designate specific priority. Priority for actions and activities is an ongoing, deliberative process within and among administrative units and faculty governance. Hence, University and college divisions are expected to align their own priorities and initiatives with this Plan.

The Strategic Plan guides the University's actions for the next five years. Implementation occurs under the leadership of the Provost, with direction and monitoring by the President and the President's Executive Cabinet. The Office of Institutional Research will provide an annual report to the Cabinet, including assessment data and information collected from administrative, staff, students, and faculty leadership regarding their unit's accomplishments related to the strategic actions, activities, and effectiveness indicators.

To move toward implementation of the Strategic Plan, a Strategic Plan Working Group was formed in November 2007, with the following charge:

The Strategic Plan Working Group will seek input on prioritization and implementation from the larger campus community, including the Academic Senate, and make recommendations for prioritization and implementation to the President's Executive Cabinet.

The membership of the Strategic Plan Working Group consists of the following individuals:

Lynn Johnson, Speaker of the Faculty
Mark Thompson, Speaker-elect of the Faculty
John Sarraille, Faculty representative recommended by the Committee on Committees
Director of Institutional Research
Stacey Morgan-Foster, Vice President for Student Affairs
William Covino, Provost

On November 20, 2007, a call was sent to the campus community to seek input to the following question:

Of the Strategic Plan's twenty-six strategic actions (1.1-1.9, 2.1-2.8, 3.1-3.9) which should be among the first on which we concentrate as the plan is implemented?

In addition to individual responses, responses were invited from standing committees and other representative bodies on campus, including the Academic Senate, Associated Students, Labor Council, Staff Council, and Academic Affairs Council.

Responses received were forwarded to the Office of the Provost, compiled, and forwarded to the Strategic Plan Working Group on January 9, 2008. The prioritization spreadsheet was shared and discussed during the February 26, 2008, Academic Senate meeting. The results follow in priority order:

- 1.1 Continue the tradition of engagement to enhance overall success of diverse student body
- 1.2 Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs
- 1.6 Comprehensive student advising program
- 1.7 Emphasize internships, workshops, and career skills development for success after graduation
- 1.8 Strengthen the General Education program
- 2.1 Recruit and retain an engaged, diverse faculty
- 2.3 Professional development, growth, and achievement of staff
- 2.4 Provide accessible, comprehensive library services

The Academic Senate met on March 11, 2008, and recommended the following action items as being of the highest priority:

- 1.2 Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs
- 2.1 Recruit and retain an engaged, diverse faculty
- 2.3 Professional development, growth, and achievement of staff
- 2.4 Provide accessible, comprehensive library services

The Strategic Plan Working Group met on April 7, 2008, to discuss next steps in the recommendation of Strategic Plan priorities to the President's Executive Cabinet. A memorandum dated April 24, 2008, recommending Strategic Plan priorities for 2008-09 was forwarded to the President's Executive Cabinet.

On April 25, 2008, the President's Executive Cabinet approved the Strategic Plan priorities for 2008-09:

1. There will be an annual report on the progress of the Plan as early in the fall semester as possible, including measures of the Plan's indicators.
2. All actions in the Strategic Plan remain important, and should be considered University priorities.
3. Following broad campus consultation, the Strategic Actions that appear to be of most immediate importance for academic year 2008-2009 are (in numerical order):
 - a. 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.
 - b. 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.
 - c. 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.
 - d. 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty.
 - e. 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.

- f. 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff.
 - g. 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.
4. Further, campus-wide input should be sought during spring 2008 on the Activities and Effectiveness Indicators associated with the Strategic Actions above, including recommendations for modifying the Activities/Indicators sections.

:je 5/13/08

APPENDIX C

CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan Survey

The California State University, Stanislaus Strategic Plan - Framing the Future - was approved in 2007. The intent of the Strategic Plan was to guide the University's actions for the next five years. University and college divisions were expected to align their own priorities and initiatives with the Strategic Plan. In 2008, a call was sent to the campus community to seek input to the following question: "Of the Strategic Plan's twenty-six strategic actions, which should be among the first on which we concentrate as the plan is implemented?" Following broad campus consultation, seven Strategic Plan priorities were selected, and subsequently approved by the President's Executive Cabinet.

The following survey is intended to assess the full-range of accomplishments and achievements of the Strategic Plan, as well as the current status of activities and initiatives as a result of implementation of the Strategic Plan Priorities. Of interest is to gather information regarding the level of program activity related to the Strategic Plan Priorities, to learn what new needs have arisen, and to learn what new challenges or barriers have arisen that have or may impede the successful accomplishment of the Strategic Plan Priorities. We ask that you please respond as best you can to the survey items. If certain items do not apply, so indicate.

Your input, thoughtfulness, and general feedback are important. Please be assured that your responses are strictly confidential and you will not be identified in any way with the results. Thank you for helping to assess the impact of the Strategic Plan.

For your convenience, the following links take you to additional background information about the CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan and to the Strategic Plan Implementation Priorities.

CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan
Strategic Planning Implementation

Q2 How well do you think CSU Stanislaus is accomplishing its mission as envisioned in the Strategic Plan?

- Very well (4)
- Well (3)
- Somewhat (2)
- Not well (1)
- Not applicable (0)

Q3 Thinking about the University as a whole, in your opinion to what extent is each Strategic Planning Priority integrated with program improvement within the University?

	SP Priorities					Please elaborate
	Very Well Integrated (4)	Well Integrated (3)	Somewhat Integrated (2)	Not Integrated (1)	Not Applicable (0)	comment (1)
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Q4 Within your specific area, to what extent is the Strategic Planning Priority integrated with program improvement?

	SP Priorities					Please elaborate
	Very Well Integrated (4)	Well Integrated (3)	Somewhat Integrated (2)	Not Integrated (1)	Not Applicable (0)	comment (1)
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Q5 In your opinion, how valuable with regard to program improvement, have the Strategic Planning Priorities been to your specific area?

	SP Priorities					Please elaborate
	Extremely valuable (4)	Very Valuable (3)	Somewhat Valuable (2)	Not Valuable (1)	Not Applicable (0)	comment (1)
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
SP Priority 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs. (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Q6 Within your specific area, do you have a system for aligning resources with the current Strategic Plan?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q7 How are these decisions made and by whom?

Q8 Given your experience, please describe your specific area's approach for implementing the following Strategic Plan Priorities. (Click below if not applicable.)

	Please describe	Click here if
	approach for implementing (1)	Not Applicable (1)
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. (1)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning. (2)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (3)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty. (4)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff. (5)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff. (6)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs. (7)		<input type="radio"/>

Q9 Given your experience, what evidence or data has your specific area gathered that describes impact or results. (Click below if not applicable.)

	Please describe	Click here if
	impact or result (1)	Not Applicable (1)
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. (1)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 1.3: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning. (2)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 1.6: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (3)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.1: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty. (4)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.3: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff. (5)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.4: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty, and staff. (6)		<input type="radio"/>
SP Priority 2.5: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs. (7)		<input type="radio"/>

Q10 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement. "Overall, the University has benefited from the Strategic Planning Priorities."

- Strongly agree (5)
- Agree (4)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Disagree (2)
- Strongly Disagree (1)

Q11 In your opinion, what would you say is the greatest single challenge facing CSU Stanislaus over the next five years?

Q12 In your opinion, what Strategic Plan Priority should CSU Stanislaus preserve at all costs?

Q13 If the Strategic Plan was to be updated, what key changes would you suggest?

APPENDIX D



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 13, 2012

TO: Campus Community

FROM: Hamid Shirvani
President

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "H. Shirvani", written over the printed name.

SUBJECT: Strategic Plan Survey

I invite you to please participate in a web-based survey to assess the progress and impact of the CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan. The CSU Stanislaus Strategic Plan – *Framing the Future* – was approved in 2007. The intent of the Strategic Plan was to guide the University's actions for the next five years.

The Strategic Plan Working Group, convened by the Provost, recommended the development of an assessment survey to be administered (online) campus wide. The survey will engage all members of the campus community (faculty, staff, chairs, deans, management and administrators) regarding the Strategic Plan's priority and progress to date. The Strategic Plan Working Group's intent is to assess the full range of accomplishments and achievements, as well as to assess the current status of activities and initiatives resulting from implementation of the Strategic Plan.

I encourage you to respond to the survey. Your input, thoughtfulness, and general feedback are important for future strategic planning efforts. The Office of Institutional Research will administer the survey. Please be assured that your responses are strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with the results in any way.

Thank you for your assistance in assessing the impact of the Strategic Plan.

ONE UNIVERSITY CIRCLE • TURLOCK, CALIFORNIA 95382 • WWW.CSUSTAN.EDU • PHONE (209) 667-3201 • FAX (209) 667-3206

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • Fresno • Fullerton • East Bay • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

APPENDIX E

Strategic Planning Survey Invitation and Reminder Emails

Invitation:

Dear \${m://FirstName} \${m://LastName},

The Strategic Plan Working Group, convened by the Provost, recommended the development of an assessment survey regarding the Strategic Plan's priority and progress to date. The Strategic Plan Working Group's intent is to assess the full range of accomplishments and achievements, as well as to assess the current status of activities and initiatives resulting from implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Your input, thoughtfulness, and general feedback are important for future strategic planning efforts. Please be assured that your responses are strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with the results in any way.

Follow this link to the Survey:

[\\${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${1://SurveyURL}](#)

If you experience any technical difficulties, please email the Office of Institutional Research at IR@csustan.edu or call (209) 667-3281.

Please note that the survey allows you to leave and re-enter the survey where you left off by clicking on the survey link again. This is machine and browser based, so if you start the survey on campus and then go home to click on the link and continue from a different machine, there will be no cookie to specify where you left off.

Thank you for your assistance in assessing the impact of the Strategic Plan.

Strategic Plan Working Group

First Reminder:

Dear \${m://FirstName} \${m://LastName},

This is a friendly reminder that you have not yet completed the Strategic Plan Survey. Please do so before February 24th.

The Strategic Plan Working Group, convened by the Provost, recommended the development of an assessment survey regarding the Strategic Plan's priority and progress to date. The Strategic Plan Working Group's intent is to assess the full range of accomplishments and achievements, as well as to assess the current status of activities and initiatives resulting from implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Your input, thoughtfulness, and general feedback are important for future strategic planning efforts. Please be assured that your responses are strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with the results in any way.

Follow this link to the Survey:

[\\${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${1://SurveyURL}](#)

If you experience any technical difficulties, please email the Office of Institutional Research at IR@csustan.edu or call (209) 667-3281.

Please note that the survey allows you to leave and re-enter the survey where you left off by clicking on the survey link again. This is machine and browser based, so if you start the survey on campus and then go home to click on the link and continue from a different machine, there will be no cookie to specify where you left off.

Thank you for your assistance in assessing the impact of the Strategic Plan.

Strategic Plan Working Group

Second Reminder:

Dear [\\${m://FirstName}](#) [\\${m://LastName}](#),

This is a friendly reminder that you have not yet completed the Strategic Plan Survey. Please do so by Monday, February 27th.

The Strategic Plan Working Group, convened by the Provost, recommended the development of an assessment survey regarding the Strategic Plan's priority and progress to date. The Strategic Plan Working Group's intent is to assess the full range of accomplishments and achievements, as well as to assess the current status of activities and initiatives resulting from implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Your input, thoughtfulness, and general feedback are important for future strategic planning efforts. Please be assured that your responses are strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with the results in any way.

Follow this link to the Survey:

[\\${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${1://SurveyURL}](#)

If you experience any technical difficulties, please email the Office of Institutional Research at IR@csustan.edu or call (209) 667-3281.

Please note that the survey allows you to leave and re-enter the survey where you left off by clicking on the survey link again. This is machine and browser based, so if you start the survey on campus and then go home to click on the link and continue from a different machine, there will be no cookie to specify where you left off.

Thank you for your assistance in assessing the impact of the Strategic Plan.

Strategic Plan Working Group

Final Reminder:

Dear \${m://FirstName} \${m://LastName},

Today is the last day to complete the Strategic Plan Survey!!

The Strategic Plan Working Group, convened by the Provost, recommended the development of an assessment survey regarding the Strategic Plan's priority and progress to date. The Strategic Plan Working Group's intent is to assess the full range of accomplishments and achievements, as well as to assess the current status of activities and initiatives resulting from implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Your input, thoughtfulness, and general feedback are important for future strategic planning efforts. Please be assured that your responses are strictly confidential, and you will not be identified with the results in any way.

Follow this link to the Survey:

[Take the Survey](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

`${1://SurveyURL}`

If you experience any technical difficulties, please email the Office of Institutional Research at IR@csustan.edu or call (209) 667-3281.

Thank you for your assistance in assessing the impact of the Strategic Plan.

Strategic Plan Working Group

APPENDIX F
Technical Note
Cronbach's Alpha, Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal consistency. It measures how closely related a set of items are as a group. In analyses 1 thru 3 below, the overall Cronbach's Alpha is high [(1a)=.774, (2a)=.781, (3a)=.824], which indicates strong internal consistency among the three SPP item measures in each case. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable".) This means respondents who tended to rate one item high also tended to rate the other items high. Similarly, if a respondent rated the item low, there was a tendency to also rate the other items low.

Factor Analysis (Principal Components), Dimensionality

A high alpha measures internal consistency but does not measure dimensionality. To test whether or not a set of items are unidimensional, additional analyses are performed in each case using a factor analysis procedure (essentially Principal Component Analysis).

Thus, following each reliability analysis, a factor analysis was performed. Looking at the table labeled *Total Variance Explained*, in each case the Eigenvalue for the first factor is much larger than the Eigenvalue for the next factor (e.g., see in (1b) component 1= 2.085 vs. component 2=.568). Additionally, the first factor in each case accounts for about 70% or more of the total variance (e.g., see in (1b) % of variance= 69.501). The *Total Variance Explained* in the other two factor analyses are 70.02% and 74.714% respectively. This suggests that the selected items in each case are unidimensional.

(1a) RELIABILITY ANALYSIS: SPP 1.2 for Items Q3, Q4, and Q5

RATING SP Priority 1.2: How well priority integrated with program improvement for University
 RATING SP Priority 1.2: Your specific area, how well priority integrated with program improvement
 RATING SP Priority 1.2: How valuable strategic planning priority to your specific area

	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Cronbach's Alpha	.774	3

(1b) FACTOR ANALYSIS

Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.085	69.501	69.501	2.085	69.501	69.501
2	.568	18.934	88.435			
3	.347	11.565	100.000			

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
Q3, SP Priority 1.2	.804
Q4, SP Priority 1.2	.885
Q5, SP Priority 1.2	.809

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

(2a) RELIABILITY ANALYSIS: SPP 2.4 for Items Q3, Q4, Q5

RATING SP Priority 2.4: How well priority integrated with program improvement for University

RATING SP Priority 2.4: Your specific area, how well priority integrated with program improvement

RATING SP Priority 2.4: How valuable strategic planning priority to your specific area

	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Cronbach's Alpha	.781	3

(2b) FACTOR ANALYSIS

Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.101	70.020	70.020	2.101	70.020	70.020
2	.591	19.684	89.704			
3	.309	10.296	100.000			

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
Q3, SP Priority 2.4	.870
Q4, SP Priority 2.4	.879
Q5, SP Priority 2.4	.755

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

(3a) RELIABILITY ANALYSIS: SPP 2.5 for Items Q3, Q4, Q5

RATING SP Priority 2.5: How well priority integrated with program improvement for University

RATING SP Priority 2.5: Your specific area, how well priority integrated with program improvement

RATING SP Priority 2.5: How valuable strategic planning priority to your specific area

	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Cronbach's Alpha	.824	3

(3b) FACTOR ANALYSIS

Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.241	74.714	74.714	2.241	74.714	74.714
2	.577	19.245	93.959			
3	.181	6.041	100.000			

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
Q3, SP Priority 2.5	.915
Q4, SP Priority 2.5	.914
Q5, SP Priority 2.5	.755

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

APPENDIX G

Verbatim comments to open-ended text question items

In your opinion, what would you say is the greatest single challenge facing CSU Stanislaus over the next five years?

The entrenched ignorance, combined with massive arrogance, false intellectualism, socialism/progressivism, and "Political Correctness" masquerading as competence and a healthy, true, intellectual learning environment.
...it is going to take many, many years to regain the trust of faculty and staff and create a collaborative and healthy environment again. The campus needs new leadership, one that brings people together in a good way, not based on withholding information, being secretive and based on fear and putting folks in positions of power that will do the presidents bidding. An atmosphere of "we are all working together for the betterment of our communities, students and families in our service region and beyond as an Hispanic Serving Institution (and all ethnic groups) needs to be re-established. The voice of faculty needs to be included in the dialogue in a real and meaningful way, and it has not. Lip service and strong arm, fear tactics have been used to create an atmosphere of compliance and complicit behavior out of fear of reprisal. Trust on campus is at an all time low, and morale is beyond depressed.
1. (true) trust, respect and professionalism / 2. resources (human, fiscal, physical/structural) / 3. leadership and engagement (at all levels)
1. Budgetary concerns forced by economic outcomes. / 2. Student recruitment. / 3. Leadership
Adequate funding
Adequate funding for any priority.
Administration working with faculty.
Aligning the strategic plan with the resources that are available and convincing faculty to develop and pursue new programs of study and funding avenues to reach the goals outlined in the strategic plan.
allocation of resources (time/money/staff)
Being able to provide basic service to the students and faculty with the funding the State does not provide.
Beyond the obvious of the budget issues is the life of the students and how the current crisis is effecting their experience here. The purpose of recreation opportunities is to enhance the lives of students, faculty and staff. Recreation also plays an important role in improving the learning abilities of students. Our Fitness Center is a fantastic structure that was much needed, however, it is lacking the necessary space to fully enhance the experience on campus. CSU Stanislaus should make every effort encourage and support the expansion of the current facilities so as to provide the necessary space to cultivate offerings in recreation programming, enhance recruitment efforts, and increase alumni and community support.
budget
Budget
Budget
Budget

budget and employee morale
Budget and finance issues for higher education
Budget and funding. Finding a solution in order to provide the professional development needed for staff to continue to expand knowledge and with new systems/process that we continue to face.
Budget and poor leadership strategies by the administration. ... had been patient, polite, worked through channels and followed proper procedure. Honey works better than vinegar...
Budget and providing support for staff.
Budget and retaining seasoned and well educated staff and faculty employees.
Budget and upkeep
Budget constraints taking away release time from coordinators. Forcing faculty to work more, with less time. Will we ever get the time back, if we continue to accept these conditions?
Budget Constraints.
budget crisis
Budget cuts and management misuse of funds and misplaced priorities will decrease the quality of education by decrease in faculty and faculty moral which will trickle down to the students. A challenge on the part of faculty to do more research and publish without a reduction in teaching load; this too will eventually lead to a decrease in the quality of education.
budget cuts!
Budget cuts, top-heavy and costly administration, movement towards business model of education.
Budget decision that erode instructional programs
Budget decreases
Budget issues. / We must also examine our mission within the resources that are available to us. Following this, we must be prepared to define our mission based on the resources that we have.
Budget which results in heavier teaching load for faculty--reduce time for RSCA activities and lower the quality of teaching
BUDGET!
Budget!
Budget! There are very good people on this campus. Wonderful administrators and terrific faculty and staff. Most of our limitations are related to finances.
BUDGET! BUDGET! / Secondly, we need to develop structures where all can COLLABORATIVELY work to solve the financial challenges facing the university.
Budget, Budget, Budget--and campus climate.
Budget.
Budget. Morale.
budget; faculty salaries
Budgetary constraints that affect the overall effectiveness of students, faculty, and staff! When everyone is stressed beyond normal limits with budget worries, it is difficult to focus on anything other than day to day living.

<p>Chaotic leadership. We have money for sections, we don't have money for sections. We are over target, we are under target. We have a structural deficit, we don't have a structural deficit. Deans come and go, other administrators come and go. The result is a disorganized, unpredictable system. How can we move forward and plan with this level of chaos?</p>
<p>Cohesive leadership that identifies a few priorities and the plan for achieving them. Chaos has ruled for the last five years.</p>
<p>collaborative leadership</p>
<p>Competent leadership, integrity and transparency</p>
<p>Competitive advantage with course offerings and program recruitment and the 4 and 6 year graduation rates. I also believe we must build a culture of student-centered learning with innovative teaching and transformative engagement and learning opportunities. We must offer high demand with high support to enhance a culture of scholarship, both for our employees and our students coupled with organizational renewal and focus on cross-divisional collaboration and innovations.</p>
<p>Continued budget constraints/cuts that impact every aspect of campus, causing us to continue to try to do more with less. Some units on campus have been all but gutted.</p>
<p>Continued strong leadership with student needs as the focus.</p>
<p>Continuing to maintain high quality education that serves some of the least well-prepared students in California in the face of falling budgets and an administration that has little regard for higher education teaching. The administration's single-minded emphasis on research in the RPT process gives faculty little incentive to participate in the many opportunities for professional development in teaching, special outreach programs for at-risk students, and ancillary functions like advising--none of which are given much weight in the RPT process. In an effort to make our institution 'larger and more mature,' the administration is currently neglecting all the things that have made CSU, Stanislaus an excellent teaching institution serving a poor, minority-dominated, and under-educated area of the state.</p>
<p>Courageous Leadership - we have a severe deficit of administrative leadership; we need persons who will inspire, challenge and invigorate the campus employees toward greatness and quality work; there does not seem to be anyone willing to make the hard decisions and stand by them; we need leaders who can hire the right people to do the right job, and to help the wrong employees to move on from the wrong jobs; we need leaders who can say no and mean it, when necessary / / Union Dissension - we have rampant misuse of union power on our campus by so-called state level representatives who have no true vested interest in our employees, but rather their own personal job security - which is dependent on creating and continuing drama and disunity on our campus; we need union represented employees to know their rights, and not allow non-campus thugs to tie up the time of, otherwise helpful and concerned supervisors, with wild-goose-chase research and defenses for non "stragic plan priority" based issues / / Lack of Innovation - our campus is stuck in the 20th century, although we are told to be innovative, there is almost no support for new ideas, procedures or new ways to operate; we need the freedom to do what is best for the campus based on the strategic priorities that are set, and to accomplish those goals through innovation we determine as managers and professionals in the field; there are many technology based innovations that stand to help the campus' mission to educate the public, but we are unable to spend any time researching and implementing when time is wasted on personnel matters that HR doesn't take the lead on</p>

<p>CSU Stanislaus need to find its identity as either an Upper Division community college serving the needs of a specific geographic catchment area first (I estimate two thirds of the CSU campuses fall into this category) or part of a larger network of specialized CSUs complementing the other specialized upper echelon of CSUs (I. e. Cal Poly SLO or Pomona for Engineering & Business). While there is nothing wrong with turning out students with a solid degree but few if any connections to the workforce in which the students work (for-profit colleges occupy the same market segment), having such a highly respected and competitive Nursing program seems out of place on this campus. Establishing the types of partnerships that could grow a department like Nursing, or all of Natural Sciences for that matter into a regionally renowned and highly-skilled workforce pipeline program requires more than STEM grants, it requires a presidential commitment that seems unlikely in the current economic climate. However, developing more online curriculum, providing greater online degree program offerings, and operating more efficiently in order to become more competitive with the for-profits seems like low-hanging fruit and would probably benefit the campus more over the next five years.</p>
<p>Decisions are made by Administration only. Bottom line, going through this process in eccentrically less valuable to me, I'm not sure if my opinion would count. I m just happy to be working at this time.</p>
<p>Developing a viable strategy for adapting to budget cuts in the most efficient and balanced way possible, under the circumstances.</p>
<p>Economy</p>
<p>effective course management planning to ensure that students get the courses they need to graduate. we are admitting too many students who can't get the courses they need and end up taking up seats in courses they don't need just to get enough units for financial aid. some majors (e.g., biology) are impacted and can't meet the course needs of students (majors and non-majors).</p>
<p>Encouraging initiative at every level of the organization... something that seems frowned upon currently.</p>
<p>Establishing a culture of collaboration and trust. Right now the faculty seem to be suspicious of everything the administration is doing. Unfortunately, there hasn't been much evidence to counter this suspicion.</p>
<p>Faculty salaries that have been stagnant for years. With rising inflation, this will become a major issue.</p>
<p>finances</p>
<p>Financial resources. The limited resources we have had available in the past several years has adversely effected faculty, staff, students and in many respects the community. We are extremely challenged and often limited in our abilities to provide the exceptional service that we feel is one of the most critical roles we play on campus and in promoting the strategic plan.</p>
<p>Financing</p>
<p>Finding a way to do more with less as a campus, while navigating the agenda's of many individuals.</p>

<p>First - This survey limits the ability to comment on the overall success of the plans 26 priorities by focusing only upon those 7 priorities identified by a primarily faculty group for 2008-09. Our area has spent every year working toward multiple priorities that are applicable toward our efforts as well as 4 of the President's 6 Key Initiatives. Unfortunately only 1 of the plans 12 priorities that are relevant to our operations is listed in this survey. / Greatest Challenge - Ethical leadership promoting and supporting a Strategic Plan throughout the organization that puts service above self and that rewards creativity, innovation, and achievement. This will create an environment for student success, campus relevance, and a behavioral culture where respect for others replaces blame and degradation of others.</p>
<p>Funding is our primary problem. I do not see the state stepping in to save the CSU.</p>
<p>Funding of the university is the greatest challenge, and being too dependent of State funding...! It is not a solution to raise tuition and cut programs (education) especially in the valley, where we need well educated people to turn this sinking ship around to make the valley a better place to live in every aspect.</p>
<p>Funding the academic programs that bring the students to our campus. We have continually increased enrollments because of the hard work of our faculty and staff. Unfortunately, customer service is being downgraded on this campus due to the lack of sufficient staffing. As we grow in numbers of students and faculty, we need to increase the number of staff to support them. We should consider reducing highly paid Administrators and hire our much needed staff. Faculty need the staff support to do their jobs well and the students deserve the excellent customer service they were use to receiving on our campus.</p>
<p>Getting our students what they need to obtain a degree in four years</p>
<p>Getting qualified faculty when the situation is so bad in so many different ways.</p>
<p>getting the administration and faculty to agree on common goals the cooperate to achieve them; increase transparency at all levels; work to broaden the base of participation in vital discussions</p>
<p>having the resources to provide a support network that will allow our student population to succeed with the number of first generation college students, returning Veteran students, etc. they will need access to counseling, academic support, financial support, and feeling connected to the university</p>
<p>Higher demand from student population with continued cut backs and negative fiscal ramifications</p>
<p>Hiring more faculty, accommodating the number of students that are trying to get the classes they need.</p>
<p>How do we best leverage our limited/shrinking funding, using new technology to better reach students while still ensuring *quality* education. / / Our primary service area has huge educational and economic needs (high poverty rate, low educational attainment rate, significant ESL population, etc.), and CSU Stanislaus should be a key player in addressing some of those needs. Limited/shrinking state funding means we must do more with less, and new technologies and strategies can help. However, given the needs of our are, the university must strive to offer quality "liberal arts" programs (and not just a for-profit college/diploma mill knock-off).</p>
<p>I am concerned that insufficient resources are going to the university's teaching mission.</p>
<p>In the College of Education, it is keeping up with the dramatic changes that are occurring in K-12 education and the ability to address the needs of schools by producing highly qualified teachers, counselors and administrators. If we do not meet this challenge, Colleges of Education will become obsolete.</p>
<p>Increasing cost of tuition</p>

Increasing faculty and student expectations set against continuing budget (and service) reductions
It is disheartening that employees have been here for several years and have not received a pay raise or any other benefit when deserved. I have seen great employees and ambassadors who bring so much to this campus leave because they can make more money elsewhere when they have not received a raise over several years. I hope this will be addressed before more employees leave this institute to others based on lack of deserved pay raises due to their hard work and dedication (in the next 5 years)
Keeping education affordable
Keeping programs active within budget constraints.
Keeping the faculty focused on quality teaching while increasing class size and demanding research with insufficient funds.
Lack of honest dialogue between faculty and administration
Lack of knowledge of what academics truly is and the teaching focus of CSU Stanislaus from higher administration
Lack of money
Lack of respect.
Lack of support from the people of California in terms of funding to support existing programs is the biggest challenge from without. The Challenge from within is leadership who do not put student firsts and think of the university as a business instead of a learning centered institution.
Leadership
Leadership out of touch with the university mission.
Maintaining a high quality learning environment that we've been able to provide and have been recognized for.
Maintaining a stable and engaged workforce (administration, staff and faculty) despite the challenges of reduced funding.
Maintaining access to excellent academic programs with significantly diminished resources.
Maintaining and ensuring delivery of a quality education and educational services in the face of damaging budgetary shortfalls.
Maintaining our ability to provide an excellent education to our students as we continue to take hits to our budget.
Maintaining quality education and services to increasing number of students with fewer staff and faculty will eventually result in student dissatisfaction. Once that happens, it takes years to recover and repair our image. We are no longer a small school since the student ratio to staff and faculty is so much greater than it was 5 years ago. You cannot continue to ask for more from your employees with fewer resources and expect to maintain the integrity of the degrees and programs offered here. One thing that students used to say to me all the time when I first started is how helpful and friendly and accessible everyone was. I don't hear that so much anymore.
Maintaining the integrity of the primary mission of the CSU as a teaching institution despite external pressures to shift focus to research activities and other financially advantageous endeavors that detract from faculty members ability to maintain focus on the quality of teaching
Making positive outcomes out of difficult situations. Keeping a sense of ethics strong in a "business-model" run campus. / Keeping good faculty and student around...
Manage resources effectively without destroying the core mission of the University
Managing the budget, enrollment, and program prioritization

matching resources with the mission and strategic plan. given past and present cuts we are struggling with this match.
matching the financial circumstance with the campus mission
Mismanagement driven by the inappropriate application of a business framework to a public educational institution.
money
Money
Money / RPT process expects way too much work
money for technology, & we are bare bones with staff now / how do you improve & grow when it takes all you have just to function & maintain?
Money.
money--resources--an administration that doesn't arbitrarily make decisions that should be made by the faculty or by working together with the faculty. More engagement with the faculty.
New programs, and realignment of current programs to be effective and efficient
NO MONEY!!!!
Obviously the budget. The strategic plan could have a positive impact on CSU Stanislaus, but at a time when resources are dwindling, there isn't a lot either the faculty or administration can do to have a strong impact on the goals of the strategic plan. For example, how is a department supposed to maintain a diverse faculty when they have lost 30% of their faculty over the last 3 years and haven't been approved to hire? How are we supposed to even maintain the quality of education when many faculty have lost support they received for years and are pressured to raise course caps? / / Outside of the budget, the other problem is coordination. The university has always been structured in independent modules and integrating department plans with university plans (especially when conducting things like assessment) is difficult. The other problem is with the current lack of trust between administration and faculty. Even with strong leadership, in the last 5 years faculty have become increasingly distrustful of administration. This is obviously exacerbated by the fact that we now seem to have a rolling administrative staff. When CSU Stanislaus shifted from promoting internal faculty to hiring professional administrators it has become clear that we can't become too involved in any current movement on campus because the administrator who is pushing that agenda will very likely not be here in a year or two and our efforts will be wasted when another administrator comes in with their own (different) agenda.
our ability to address the needs of an increasingly diverse service area.
Overcome the challenges of budget cut and try to maintain the quality and availability of the classes we offer to our students.
Overcoming the budget crisis, not diluting academic standards, trimming administrative costs.
Overcoming the erosion of shared governance and trust.
Provide quality education. Quality is being eroded with budget cuts.
Poor leadership and lack of funds
Potential on-going budget reductions
probably budget
Providing High Quality Services and Educational Experiences for the Students we serve with less financial resources and staff.
Recovery. In all areas.

Regaining and retaining consistent leadership.
relationship (or lack thereof) between administration and the rest of the campus community
Remembering to pursue the priorities we all agreed to several years ago, in the face of both budgetary and administrative pressures to ignore them
Removing administrators who resist input from faculty.
Replacing retiring Faculty, increase students enrollment, in the face of financial difficulties.
Resources need to flow into academic programs and these should be allowed to flourish; getting back to our roots as a comprehensive liberal arts institution interested in serving students and the region.
Retain healthy enrollment to continue programs, and it s affordable to our students.
Retain the quality of education and accessible student-faculty ratios that have made CSU Stanislaus a unique campus.
Retaining good talent
<p>Retaining knowledgeable, enthusiastic staff and faculty in light of dwindling state resources. There is a significant lack of trust among campus constituents, although the environment seems less hostile than it was a year or two ago. Staff are frustrated by not receiving raises for more than half a decade even though the cost of living continues to increase. They do not trust the administration because whenever there is a deep budget cut, more staff jobs become the casualties. Vacant positions go unfilled and the current staff and faculty "pick up the slack." New staff hires are only permitted as temporary appointments with renewable contracts, which are short-term career opportunities for people seeking stability. Workloads (staff and faculty) continue to increase without appropriate adjustments to compensation. Most staff I know do not even mention (or think) of raises anymore because they feel unappreciated and undervalued - besides, if a few people received a raise, others would lose jobs (or at least this is the perception we are led to believe). Faculty and staff took furloughs for a year, all the while focusing on providing the same or higher quality service to students so the university could achieve its mission, and we did not see any positive impact from our sacrifices. Faculty accept more students into courses and feel threatened by the administration - some of them speak openly to others (including staff and students) about the administration's lack of consideration for the academic mission and attempts to transform the institution into a capitalistic business model. However, if we worked in a business atmosphere (private sector), we would have received raises, bonuses, promotions, etc. over the past several years (at a MINIMUM 1-5% raises per year). Most personnel feel as though we are on a sinking ship - it hasn't sunk yet, but it's half submerged and there are sharks circling in the water. We are undervalued, untrusted, underfunded, understaffed, uninspired about future possibilities, and overall disheartened. The greatest challenge for CSU Stanislaus will not just include managing enrollment, dealing with budget numbers, or implementing new system initiatives. The greatest challenge will hinge on the morale and trust from faculty and staff. We could (easily) make more money in the private sector, but we stay because we support the institution and its mission to better the lives of students. At some point, though, we need to feel as though WE have our INSTITUTION'S support as well. Although there is a vocal minority on campus (faculty and staff), these people do not truly represent the institution's greatest asset (and biggest challenge): the silent majority, people who are waiting fearfully and tiredly for the next wave of bad news. An organization is only as good as its people, and we need to focus on motivating and inspiring those people so we may then organize our efforts to achieve the institution's strategic goals.</p>
Retaining quality staff and faculty to perform the ever increasing workload.

Sound University leadership.
State budget and financing for university programs
state funding
Staying within state budget while providing the best higher education possible to as many students, faculty & staff as possible.
supporting the increased demand for research without providing adequate resources (release time, lab space, equipment, graduate students, funding)
the budget
The budget crisis
The budget is a great concern. Budget is forcing the University to provide the same quality of services with less staff and resources.
THE BUDGET!! Being able to keep good staff here at CSUS, and not lose them to other campus' or private sector. We have WAY to many Chiefs and not enough Indians!!!!
The budget.
The California economy. Not just in terms of funding the CSU, but also in terms of economic pressures on students and lack of employment for graduates.
The challenge the system is facing is the antiquated way our higher education system is funded.
The challenges we face are interrelated -- there is no single challenge that stands alone. The State budget is declining, but that is resulting in a shift to student fee revenue as our largest single resource. The higher education environment is changing, so our "competition" is changing. We are becoming more of a "residential" campus. The demographics of our student population is changing. The economic climate in which we exist is volatile. New modes of academic "delivery" are developing. Etc. . . .
The greatest single challenge facing CSU Stanislaus is having leaders who keep students and student education in focus when making budgetary decisions. Current decisions have shown that student needs and services have not been a central focus.
The greatest single challenge facing the CSU Stanislaus over the next five years is the ability of the campus to recover from not only the financial results of the budget crises but also the divisions in various constituencies caused by the positioning related to budget crisis.
The loss of focus and the inability to fulfill its mission due to inadequate or misapplied funding.
The privatization of higher education with a focus on business models and efficiency at the expense of student learning and growth, as well as faculty and staff morale.
The security of ones employment with the CSU system...layoffs and budget cuts.
the struggle to provide a quality education with limited to no funding and a lack of understanding on the real interworking's of the university.
There is culture of adversity and top down domination at this university which is anathema to the maintenance of a healthy academic community. Faculty are treated as serfs. Diversity of ideas is not only discouraged, but prohibited. The quest for academic freedom is interpreted as supporting rebellion on the part of the field hands.
To actually implement the strategic plan. Many of these questions were difficult to answer because I feel the strategic plan is basically ignored by decision makers in administration.

Too many chiefs and not enough Indians!! We should just fire all the faculty and staff outside of MSR and let the VP's take it on, there should be enough of them to handle all that needs to be done. After all, we just don't have time to deal with those annoying students - OK - ENOUGH - this place has totally lost its focus on why we are here - we are here for the students, not anyone else, but as I said that is no longer the case - we seem to be here to see who can get the most pocket lining now.

We are bare bones and everyone knows there is no fat left on the bones. Bottom line we all must work together in order to survive. There is no magic solution, we need to be cost effective, manage our budgets, innovative within our departments to finding new revenue sources and put a smile on our faces for the development of our students.

We need to abide by our mission statement and find a way to live with our budget. All budget decisions must consider their educational implications which we have not always done.

We need to work together and put aside our petty differences. Faculty need to recognize that they are only one leg of the stool.

Working in a truly collaborative way with administration to maintain a quality institution, given budget reductions.

Working with limited resources to achieve goals.

Workload and money, attitudes of the public to public education, administrators who are not from faculty ranks or who don't have a realistic view of faculty responsibilities

In your opinion, what Strategic Plan Priority should CSU Stanislaus preserve at all costs?

Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs
1.2
1.2
2.8
I do not believe the current set of strategic priorities properly pursue the needs of the university and the community we serve. In general the current priorities on seem only to reinforce or protect self-concerned needs of specific campus groups with a blatant disregard for the university s and community s current and emerging needs. A strategic plan is meant to allow an institution to developed and grow with purpose. The selected and emphasized priorities, for the most part, inhibit and confine the institution.
#1
1.1 / Continue the tradition of engagement to enhance overall success of diverse student body / 1.2 Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs
1.2 - it's the core of the university - everything else is in support of this.
1.2 continue to provide excellent undergrad and grad programs. This means offering enough courses, continuing and expanding faculty development activities to improve teaching
1.2 is the core function of the university and needs to be preserved...! But all the others are very important as well.
1.2 Strategic Action: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs / in the liberal arts and professions
Academic freedom. Without it you have a technical college or even a glorified high school rather than a university
Academic Programs
academic quality.
access
accessibility
All
All priorities that include student centered engagement
All Strategic Priorities are good, but if no one knows about them, or no one is held accountable to them, then they are worthless. It has to be more than a VP telling managers to adhere to the priorities, there must be a method in place to actively engage the community toward passion for the goals and priorities. Above all, the highest leadership must adhere to the strategic plans and when they hear/see campus departments applying goals based on the strategic priorities, then they must allow them to do what it takes to accomplish it.
any that push for student excellence and support the student so they reach graduation.
Continue the tradition of engagement to enhance overall success of diverse student body
Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs
Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs for a strong liberal arts education
Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions
Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and

professions.
Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.
Continue to provide the undergraduate and graduate programs
Continuing to offer strong undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts, sciences and humanities.
Core academic commitment to the liberal arts
Course offerings, small class size.
current, up to date, highest level of technology and education.
Cut the amount of VP's. Faculty layoffs. There seems to be many who have become complacent in regards to their jobs here on campus . We all should be on the same team. THE STUDENTS.....
dedicated better education to student and keep high quality faculty.
Developing programs that concentrate on need skills rather than traditional academic tracks -- the latter of which produces more BAs for the purpose of producing more BAs.
Development of new and relevant undergraduate and graduate degrees.
Do what it takes to keep our experienced staff vs. hiring new people from outside, paying them more rather than encourage our current employees to apply and offer development tools to promote within our campus.
Don't know.
Education
Education.
Effective student advising. We need to help students navigate the modifications caused by budget pressures.
eliminate excessive managers/directors. WE have more managers in a single department than staff itself
Employ less MP management(\$\$\$) and count on the people who are currently employed and value this campus and want to keep it running smoothly to promote what we stand for...A valued educational environment.
Excellence in academic programs.
Faculty and course offerings!
Faculty recruitment and retention, Student enrollment
Graduate Education
high quality instructional programs and commitment to teaching and learning
Hiring and retaining a diverse and professional faculty and staff
Hispanic serving university, serving students and finding a balance in that to also protect burn out on the part of staff and faculty. An ethnic of trust needs to be invigorated by central administration through inclusion of faculty as equal partners in decision making, not imposition. The strategic plan must include the morale and workload on campus because that morale is hurting the academic progress of both students and ability to teach by faculty.
I think we should preserve excellence in education over serving as many students as possible. I think we must begin to reduce access. The public is more likely to demand access than excellence.
Improving the excellence of academic programs offered (the first priority in the preceding lists)

In my opinion, Strategic Plan Priority 1.2 should be preserved at all costs.
Instruction
It's not about preservation; it's about change, which must occur at all costs.
Keeping staffing at adequate levels to be able to support the mission of the CSU.
liberal arts instruction
Maintain a high quality Educational Experience for our students
Maintain quality educational programs.
Maintaining an active and engaged Faculty with appropriate staff and adjunct support.
Maintaining academic quality in areas where it can be measured and demonstrated.
N/A
N/A
new programs
new programs
None of them - neither the priorities spelled out previously, nor the unmentioned ones which are actually used. That whole written plan is a mish-mash of wordiness and compromise that is worse than useless. Why is it worse? Because a lot of time and effort was wasted coming up with that... stuff. It was written in "university-speak", so it became acceptable and impressive. It is like ObamaCare - wordy, big promises, very impressive (to a certain class of people), but ultimately a horrible disaster.
Offer high quality undergraduate and graduate programs
OMG couldn't pick one single priority
Our commitment to serve the needs of our diverse service area.
Our mission statement.
Priority 1
Professional development for staff; continue to provide and expand new technology for students.
Program academic quality, effectiveness.
Provide a 9-unit workload each semester for the CBA so that faculty members can find time to engage in research.
Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs
providing a quality education to our students
Providing an excellent undergraduate and graduate education
Providing excellent undergraduate and graduate programs.
Providing opportunities and support for innovative programs that keep us competitive with other four year universities.
Providing relevant high quality academic programs to our students and everything that add values toward this goal
Providing the excellent undergraduate and graduate programs which would include supporting faculty and staff.
Provision of excellent courses in liberal arts and professions.
Quality
quality of education

Quality of instruction.
Quality of our education, efficiency, and effectiveness. / We must invest in our current self support programs and plan on offering more innovative and revenue generating programs through UEE. / We have faced serious permanent budget cuts so in order to move forward, we must plan on growing our self-support programs. /
Quality of our programs and service for students. Why else would we exist. /
Quality programs.
Quality undergraduate education
Quality undergraduate education.
Quality undergraduate programs.
Reduce salary of administrators
Retain all existing departments.
Retain great and diverse faculty
Serve the students. We need to remember that the students are our customers. We work for them.
SERVICE TO STUDENTS!!
SP 1
SP 1.2
SP 1.2 - provide excellent grad and undergrad programs - we need to focus on the programs most needed and demanded by our students. Some of the smaller programs have academic value but may not most effectively utilize our resources.
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. This is our mission in my opinion.
SP Priority 1.2: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. / The students should come first.
Staff and faculty
staff jobs
Stop cutting back jobs from administration because we are here to serve the ever growing student population
Strategic Action: Support colleges in developing and reinforcing their distinct academic / identities.
Strength of academic programs that are central to the mission.
Student access to higher education
Student achievement
Student engagement, development and student achievement
Student learning
Student services and support.
support for teaching, leadership, and research.
Support of academic programs (1st priority)
Support services to students and faculty and staff

Support Undergraduate Research at all cost.
Take care of their employees, from the bottom to the top.
teaching mission and core faculty
Teaching, and those services that help less-well-prepared students succeed in higher education.
Technology support to implement new initiatives so that new ways of doing day-to-day tasks are possible (e.g., workflow, digital signatures, imaging).
The college should preserve at all costs should be it's overall success of educating a diverse student body with a diverse faculty/staff /administrators that are current with todays ever changing skills.
The first one, maintaining excellent academic programs.
The mission of providing accessibility in higher education.
Their overall reputation, integrity and to preserve as much services as possible.
There are several: / 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7
Undergraduate education.
We need to service those classes that are hitting the majority of our students and continue to develop on line courses that service the rest of our students toward reaching their graduation requirements.
We should make sure students can be given a standardized life plan, so that they know their graduation or the availability and quality of their classes will not be compromised because of the budget cut.
We should work to keep our campus a viable, functioning institution, that is capable of adapting and developing as we move forward . . .
What is the Plan?
You wouldn't believe me if I told you.

If the Strategic Plan was to be updated, what key changes would you suggest?

A focus on teaching and innovation with integrated campus relationships and services and programs that foster student engagement and student success.
A more clearly articulated commitment to serve the needs of our diverse service area.
A more specific plan for implementation and measurable learning outcome to ensure the goals are being met.
Adjust for budget realities.
An emphasis on promoting from within, as opposed to hiring from an outside source, which usually results in a higher salary being paid to a new employee. Reward the knowledge and effort of loyal employees, whether it be faculty or staff.
Attention to the balance between teaching and research in faculty workloads, in connection with the current tendency to increase teaching loads beyond manageable levels.
Be certain that the campus community is aware via postmaster, letters, and forums
Be more specific and less esoteric.
Before revisiting the Plan, I would want some explanation as to why the existing Plan has not been foremost in the decisions regarding the campus response to budget pressures, and why the administration seems to be pursuing an agenda that is not grounded in the existing Plan. There's really no point in spending time and energy on an update to the Plan if the new Plan serves as trivial a role in University decision making as the old Plan.
Better integration with the community. Increase community understanding of what we do and why it is important. Focus research and scholarship locally as much as possible to benefit our community. For example, more open events on campus - one thought would be bringing appropriate faculty and community leaders together once a month to discuss current issues of local importance
Better staff training of the CSU system, organization, and tools.
budgetary ones
Change RPT
Clarify of decision making regarding faculty governance and university administrators. A lot of time and energy is being expended on this topic that may be best used in other places.
Clarify that funding needs to be prioritized for teaching in order to meet the goal to continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions.
Concentrate on process and implementation improvement.
CSUS Administration Hosting a Strategic Planning Program for key campus entities and services to engage them in the Strategic Planning process for their respective areas and see how their Strategic Plan integrates into the Master Strategic Plan of the University.
Develop, PRESERVE, & EXPAND programs that CAN BE demonstrated TO MEET the greatest EMPLOYMENT NEEDS OF CALIFORNIA, KEEPING the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning. (for example, NURSING, COMPUTER SCIENCE, and COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS)
Difficult to say when the budget is in a state of negative flux.
Don't bother if we're only going to pay lip service to it.
don't know
Don't know.

Don't think it is valuable - same old same old - meetings, outpourings of paper, little support or encouragement to make it happen (cajoling doesn't count)
Drop the emphasis on new programs
Emphasis on programs and services whose goal are to support faculty and staff whose work is clearly tied to providing students the tools they need to succeed. Financial aid, Student Support Services, Grants, Library Services are all in need of additional assistance.
Emphasize a teaching load of 9 units each semester for the CBA so that faculty members can engage in research to keep AACSB accreditation.
Emphasize engagement with faculty, diversity of ideas and return to the basic goal of educating the future leaders of our state and country rather than running the place like a car factory.
Emphasize the importance of liberal arts education and the element that has distinguished us: a small size and personal touch in our educational programs.
Enhanced life long learning opportunities
Finding corporate partnerships that allow for research opportunities.
Focus based on authentic, broad consultation.
focus on quality education and better relationship between faculty and administration
Focus on quality education.
Focusing and integrating.
Good question, which cannot be answered so quickly...We need to save more energy and use solar and other renewable resources to conserve money...it should be integrated into the strategic plan as well...
Greater emphasis on SP1.
Greater involvement of staff. We do the grunt work. We know what works in our area and we can provide invaluable input. A plan without the support of the troops usually ends in tragedy.
haven't considered.
Hiring administrators with vision, not simplistic growth and efficiency myopia.
I believe many parts of the strategic plan are sound, but the specific focus metrics fail to advance the sound goals of the strategic plan. It truly seems as if several of the priorities were selected to prohibit progress as identified in the strategic plan. And indeed that is what has occurred in practice. In order to respond to these fundamental deficiencies and new strategic plan should emphasize the mission of the university. That mission focuses on societal advancement in our region by providing residents with a transformative and enabling education resource. Unfortunately the current implementation of our strategic plan was seemingly designed to protect internal special interest at the university. As such, benefits to the university's mission have only been promoted when they happen to align with the self-concerned desires of internal special interests. This construct should be turned on its head and recognition of the university's mission and purpose should be emphasized.
I do not have as intimate a knowledge of the plan as I would need to respond meaningfully to this question.
I do not recommend investing time and resources in an update right now.
I explained this in the previous field. /
I have no clue.
I have no suggestions

I quite frankly am not that informed of the Strategic Plan. I don't feel that I can be a good judge of just how effective it is.
I think the plan is strong and comprehensive. Our only issue in athletics is not being aware of this plan.
I would revise the strategic plan to include a stronger emphasis on the campus as a cohesive community.
I would suggest a handful of key areas rather than a catch-all list.
I wouldn't change so much as I would redouble efforts on Strategic Plan Priority 1.6.
Including a plan for faculty voice that is honest and real, and that demonstrates a wiliness to honor, listen and respond, implement faculty decisions. The instability of deans coming and going, interim deans, MPP's, etc. has left staff and faculty not sure which lie to believe, or which rumor is more hurtful. / / I suggest that faculty governance be respected by central administration. Something that is not, and has not been happening. Lip service to faculty governance needs to stop.
Input from community partners as to how well our mission is being met.
It is a good plan as it is. From my perspective, it needs more buy-in from everyone on campus. I was not aware that it existed and after reading it I don't feel the like University is acting as a whole to move toward its goals. Perhaps strategic plans need to be developed at the college levels with goals aligned with the University's plan so action can be seen a lower levels.
Just use it to make decisions. Otherwise it is an exercise of wasting time and resources!!!
Let's examine how research actually fits into the scheme of faculty duties. Currently, the strategic plan ignores research entirely, yet administration seems to make it the highest priority. If the strategic plan does not spell out the relationship of scholarship and teaching at our institution, administration will be free to play its own game with faculty, ignoring the strategic plan altogether.
Lets reduce staff in MSR - take out a couple of those positions with pay close to 6 digits and take care of student needs.
Long term look at the number of tenure track faculty. It needs to increase (with number of non-tenure track decreasing).
make the strategic plan an active part of the planning process. I have never heard administrators refer to it.
More development opportunities for our staff.
More emphasis on revenue generating plans
more focus and specify, especially relative to priorities
More focused
more hiring of full time, tenure track faculty, rather than VLs
N/a
N/A
n/a
N/A
None
None
None at this time
None at this time.

None, but most people don't have the time to be checking whether their actions align with the plan. Like most strategic plans it looks good, but it makes very little difference.
Not sure
Not to necessarily have the priorities in order but to stress the need for all the responses and recommendations to be dependent upon each other for the Plan to succeed.
Of the current plan, 3.6 and 3.9 are the only ones that I don't still see as tied to our core (they're fine but these are PR related rather than tied to the quality of the educational experience). I think it might be valuable to reconsider which areas are emphasized over the next few years, and to consider why some priorities were completely ignored even if not emphasized (i.e. the 3% growth was exceeded all but one year of the plan, and Stockton is floundering as a presence). I also think we should consider carefully how the failure to adhere to the strategic plan and to processes of shared governance have limited progress over the past few years, and to recommit to the intention and essence of this plan.
Our current "plan" is more a collection of (lofty?) "ideals" than an actual plan. It mostly consists of "things to keep in mind" while we go about our business. They are generally unobjectionable, but at the same time, not particularly helpful in terms of making specific decisions. / / Key change: in the coming years, we will be faced with a variety of challenges (budgets, competition, environment, economy). Our very survival may come into question. We need to think about how we position ourselves as a valuable (and viable) alternative within the ecosystem of higher education. We need to understand ourselves and our place within that ecosystem better, so that we can actually make meaningfully strategic decisions.
perhaps adding something about integrating with the local community as a goal
Periodically review all programs for effectiveness using measurable data.
Prioritize the Academic Programs to be funded appropriately and cut in other areas. The students are primarily here to obtain a degree and need the necessary courses to graduate. We need to make it simpler for them to have access to their classes.
Put on hold until growth and excellence can be supported.
realistic planning that includes financial hardship
Recognize who we are and what we do well.
resource space. Many programs do not have space to expand teaching and are cramped in small classrooms with no lab space.
Scrap it. Start over. Almost all of us will all benefit, but students definitely will. And isn't that why we are here? I will assume you actually agree with that reason, so I'll continue with a few suggestions. / 1. Focus our activities on student education. / 2. Provide a proper university level education. Provide at least the minimum required skills necessary to function in modern society. / 3. Focus on teaching the truth. (This will allow the university to cut back 10 to 50% on the garbage currently being taught.) / 4. Focus on the needs of our region. Provide relevant majors, classes and credentials based on those needs. / / There is so much more that needs to be said, but I see the next button is "submit survey", so you're not even asking the relevant questions. / / And just so you know, you will probably get the results you are expecting from this survey, but you are asking the wrong questions, so the results are, unfortunately for the students, ultimately not helpful.
Significant reorganization of the College of Education

SP 2.3 indicates we should provide effective growth and support for staff, but I don't see it occurring. I suggest some initiatives to demonstrate that staff have value. An annual picnic (which staff pay for and half of them don't attend) is not enough to appropriately bolster morale.
take out 2.2; 2.4;2.5
That there would be a clear connection made between strategies for academic AND support services. I suggest that the implementation plan for the strategic priorities is almost more important than the strategies themselves. If there is no way to clearly implement the plans, then they are useless.
The plan doesn't need to be updated, it needs to be followed.
the plan in many ways satisfies the needs of everyone without an attempt to give some priorities
The plan itself does not seem flawed, but priorities within the plan should be more collaboratively determined, especially when tough choices need to be made due to fiscal challenges.
There needs to be more discussion on what programs are relevant today and where future needs for our graduates may lie. We need to be as relevant as possible.
This is giving me a huge headache. I don't mean to be a jerk in filling out this survey, but honestly, to come up with a thoughtful and useful answer would take reading and reading the plan and considerable amount of thought. I'm overwhelmed with grading and over crowded classes. So, I'm not spending the energy to do it.
Throw the damn thing out and start all over again.
tighter focus and scope, much more limited reach
To have a reserve in place for our university budget for severe years and to install a parking garage for better parking.
unsure
We should make a commitment about planning the classes we would offer for the next 5 years. We should honor the commitment we make for the students. Even the class get cancelled, the students should be offered the options of doing it as an independent study, so that their graduation will not be delayed because of the causes that are beyond their control.