

## Report on Efforts to Update the Strategic Plan – February 20, 2014

This is a report on efforts of staff and members of the CSUS Center for Collaborative Policy to develop and complete a process to update the Strategic Plan.

The process includes a Design Team comprised of five experienced members of staff.

The Design Team and Center for Collaborative Policy members have begun working together to clarify project goals, objectives and the scope of work.

The major steps in the process to develop the Strategic Plan include:

- **Research** – This is underway. It includes identification of statutory Commission authority, mandates, regulations and policy documents, as well as the existing Strategic Plan and the Mission and Vision statements.
- **Stakeholder Assessment** – Is intended to obtain internal and external input about:
  - POST operations
  - Programs and services that POST does well and those not regarded as effective or necessary
  - Effective communication internally with staff and externally with stakeholders
  - Identify priorities and opportunities for POST to better serve law enforcement
  - Identify best practice
  - Identify staff and organizational development opportunities
- **Interviews** – Conducted in person either as individuals or in groups. These will last about one hour each. Budgeted for 40 interviews (internal and external input); will include a cross section of individuals (professional associations, training presenters, law enforcement agencies (small, medium and large/rural and urban), training managers, labor and management, academies, and public safety dispatch staff and trainers) – many are reflected in the composition of the Commission and the Advisory Committee. Currently, at 60 – 65 interviews (well above what has been budgeted -- \$100,990)
- **Survey** – Conducted online with the objective of confirming and validating the information obtained during the interviews. All members of the Commission and Advisory Committee will be asked to complete the survey.
- **Research & Assessment Analysis/Validation** – Analyze research and assessment data to identify differences between legislative intent and current POST practices and program effectiveness. Will include internal and external stakeholders participating in focus group meetings to review and validate the findings.
- **Strategic Planning Workshop** – Using research and assessment results from the focus groups, the Center for Collaborative Policy will collaborate with internal and external

participants to create draft mission and vision statements, goals and objectives, and an action plan to implement the goals and objectives.

- **Draft Strategic Plan/Validation** – Using data from the Workshop, the Center for Collaborative Policy will draft a 3 – 5 year strategic plan and a 12 – 18 month initial work plan with recommendations for staff training, succession planning, and plan maintenance. Internal and external stakeholders will meet to review and validate the findings and draft plan.
- **Update and Finalize Draft Strategic Plan** – The draft plan will be reviewed and approved by the Executive Team (i.e., Executive Director, 3 AEDs); it will then be submitted to the Advisory Committee and the Commission for review and approval.
- **Implementation** – The Center for Collaborative Policy will provide the Executive Team with a memorandum detailing recommended organizational changes needed to support the Strategic Plan.

### **Questions?** (regarding the process)

### **Participation of the Commission and Advisory Committee in the Development of the Strategic Plan -- Alternatives**

There are various ways the Commission and the Advisory Committee may wish to participate in the process to develop the Strategic Plan. The staff developed alternatives are provided to stimulate discussion and intended to result in a decision that provides staff with direction.

1. **Full Involvement** – This would involve all members of the Commission and the Advisory Committee participating in each aspect of the developmental process.
  - a. Each interviewed (15 Commissioners/14 Advisory Committee members = 29)
  - b. Each completes the survey (will occur regardless of the alternative chosen)
  - c. Each would participate in the various workshops (at least three)
  - d. Each would review all documents developed in furtherance of the process

NOTE: This option would extend the time required to complete the process; it would add significant cost above the amount previously authorized by the Commission; it would require additional meetings; each would require substantial coordination by staff with the members to schedule the meetings; each would need to be publically noticed and would require providing for sufficient meeting space to accommodate all participants and members of the public.

2. **Moderate Involvement** – This alternative would involve participation of a small number of Commissioners and Advisory Committee members (e.g., 2 to 3) appointed by the respective Chairs of these bodies. The sub-committees would be involved in the process to the same extent described in the first alternative. The members of the sub-committees would report back to the members of the Commission and Advisory Committee.

NOTE: This option would also extend the time required to complete the process; result in increased costs; would require participation in the meetings by the sub-committee

members; require substantial coordination to schedule the members to participate in the meetings; would require that the meetings be publically noticed; and would require additional meeting space to accommodate participants and members of the public.

3. **Routine Involvement** – This option reflects the usual practice of the Commission and Advisory Committee relying upon staff to conduct thorough research, perform comprehensive analysis, provide information and make recommendations for action by the Commission. These are the things staff routinely does in support of the Commission concerning development of regulation, attending to fiscal and financial matters, addressing legislative mandates, and responding to specific Commission direction.
- a. This option would include staff providing monthly reports to the Commission and Advisory Committee members regarding the process and the progress to develop the Strategic Plan.
  - b. It would include reports to the Commission and Advisory Committee at their regular meetings in June and October 2014.
  - c. These meeting would allow for review of the work done.
  - d. It would allow the Commission and Advisory Committee opportunity for input and guidance to the process and the resulting work products; and,
  - e. Both bodies would ultimately approve the new Strategic Plan.

NOTE: This option would not extend the timeline to complete the process; result in increased costs; result in additional meetings required of Commissioners and Advisory Committee members; create additional coordination of scheduling required of the members and of staff; not require additional public notice of meetings; or cause additional meeting space to be needed to accommodate members of the public.

**Discussion?** There may be other options/alternatives Commissioners my wish to offer and discuss.

The Advisory Committee received this presentation and discussed the options. The Committee selected Option 3 (Routine Involvement).

Depending upon the decision by the Commission, staff will need direction regarding who among the Commission and the Advisory Committee should be interviewed -- bearing in mind the desire to hold the line on the budget to develop the new plan.