



COMMITTEE TO IMPLEMENT AND PRIORITIZE THE STRATEGIC PLAN

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 12, 2015

TO: Dr. Mark Thompson
Speaker of the Faculty

FROM: Dr. James T. Strong 
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Chair, Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan (CIPSP)

SUBJECT: CIPSP Response to Memo from Speaker Thompson (9-23-2015)

Thank you for the questions and suggestions outlined in your memo of 9-23-2015 (attached). CIPSP reviewed the document carefully at a number of meetings and appreciates this feedback. The Committee felt a response in writing would be useful for all and show clearly how many of the suggestions were incorporated into the document or process. The questions or comments from the 9-23 memo are in italics, and the CIPSP response is in regular type.

General questions:

1. Can this document or the Plan make clearer that and how departments are expected to respond to the Plan and priorities?

We believe Recommendation Three provides direction for the role of departments as follows.

Recommendation Three

The Provost, in consultation with the Strategic Plan Working Group, will convene the responsible parties to annually report on progress made on the goals recommended by CIPSP at the start of the fall semester. The mechanisms to report on progress may include open forums and other activities and will include an annual report. The reporting process and report will be concluded by September 15th and distributed thereafter.

Academic departments would be expected to work with college deans to report on progress on the various goals, objectives and action items. CIPSP strongly recommends that the reporting process not be onerous; the process should dovetail with other reporting processes and utilize appropriate software to further reduce the reporting burden.

2. Can an explanation be included that explains the link between the CIPSP priorities and the deliberations of the University Budget Planning Committee (UBAC) as many of the items may require substantial resources?

Yes, Recommendation Four has been changed and now includes a specific link to UBAC.

Recommendation Four

The charge for a subsequent strategic planning committee (whether that be a continuation of CIPSP or a strategic planning committee focused on revising/or creating another strategic plan or both) should require that the strategic planning process establish clear horizontal and vertical linkages between institution wide goals and those of academic schools, administrative departments, and the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) (see "Executive Summary," Strategic Planning Vertical Integration, Hanover Research 2015, attached).

3. As written, the actions appear to be (anticipated, intended) results, rather than specifying the actions themselves.

That is correct and intended. CIPSP leaves it to the decision makers closest to the outcome domain to decide what actions are appropriate to achieve the desired result.

Goal 1:

1. Objective 1, actions 1 and 2: how well will the NSSE and CLA assess "attainment of higher level skills in all academic programs"? Faculty were puzzled about what was purported to be measured and concerned about the level of standardization. What number, percent, and demographic slice of our student body will the two measures represent?

The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) was developed by the RAND Corporation and the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) and launched in the fall of 2000. It is a standardized testing initiative that allows for a direct measure of student learning by combining two types of testing components, a set of real-world performance tasks and a set of analytic writing prompts. These are used to measure student learning in the areas of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication. Beginning in the 2006-2007 academic year, this assessment has been administered at Stanislaus State to entering freshmen in the fall and graduating seniors in the spring. We will continue to make every effort to obtain assessment results from groups of freshmen and seniors that are representative of our student body and comparable to each other.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is administered at Stanislaus State by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. This survey is designed to measure the degree of student engagement in college activities that correlate to student learning and personal development. The survey includes questions on class participation, academic rigor, amount of effort put into class work, and overall experience. Beginning in 2006, the survey has been administered every three years to undergraduate freshmen and seniors.

For both instruments, we will continue to make every effort to obtain results from groups of freshmen and seniors that are representative of our student body and comparable to each other.

2. Objective 1, action 3: Does the item include computers for faculty and equipment, e.g., for the College of Science to be provided within the two-year cycle?

We believe that you meant to reference Goal 1, Objective 3, and Action 3. What Action 3 calls for is a plan within two years. Yes, there should also be a plan to replace computers. This was not the intent of Action 3, so Action 4 was created and approved as follows.

ACTION 4: Within two years, the University will establish a reasonable computer replacement cycle.

Measured and reported by: Vice Presidents and AVP of the Office of Information Technology

Goal 2: Consider the order in which the action might occur. For example, should discussions of the University Advising Task Force and the development of College Plans precede the acquisition of information systems?

Certainly the recommendations of the University Task Force on Advising should be considered, given those recommendations will be sent to the campus community within the next few weeks. Regarding waiting for the college plans, that may or may not be appropriate. Evaluation of various software options, including developing a "homegrown" solution, is necessary, and CIPSP has been informed by the University Task Force on Advising that they have created a workgroup to evaluate options. The software selected will be accessible to disabled students. Additionally, this evaluation process will include input from colleges and the campus community through open forum(s). The work group of the University Task Force on Advising will host these open forum(s).

Goal 3: Objective 1, action 2 notes that "each major will develop a plan (that may include workshops, internships, and other activities) to transition its graduates to careers or graduate school." What is the appropriate balance between faculty creating plans and running new workshops, internships, and activities vis-a-vis work that a more robust career counseling services program might provide?

It is premature to define the balance at this time. The balance will be defined through the visioning and planning process described in Objective 1, Action item 2.

Goal 6: Should an action be included that directs us to capture and publicize how much we are already doing through service learning, etc.?

We agree and have added this to the list of action items.

ACTION 4: Within two years, record and publicize to the campus and external communities the extent and number of Service Learning activities and how Service Learning enhances the external community and students' educational experience.

Measured and reported by: Provost, Academic Deans, and Director of Service Learning

Recommendation Three: Does this section mean there will be a single annual report disseminated to the campus?

Yes, a single report will be distributed to the campus.

It's not clear, and it would be useful to have a single report available and widely disseminated.

We agree and it is now clear in Recommendation Three (cited above) that a single report will be circulated to the campus as the outcome of the reporting process.

Conclusion

Thank you for these good suggestions and comments. We would be pleased to discuss our responses with you as desired.

cc: Dr. Joseph F. Sheley, President
Mr. Dennis Shimek, Vice President, Faculty Affairs and Human Resources
Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan
Strategic Plan Working Group
Academic Senate

M111115 rep sen CIPSP_final