Feedback on criteria for support services:
Criteria 1.2 describes "after college" support as directed towards "(helping students prepare for gainful employment, contribute to their community or reconnect with the university)." The provost himself was emphatic in his statement that describing the work of the university as job training was insulting. This criteria should be re-worded to better reflect the purpose of a university education by removing a focus on "gainful employment" and instead focusing on broader life skills, i.e. "helping students prepare for a meaningful life."

April 9

I have a new program that the primary receivers of the service are faculty, staff, administrators, and the community. My work indirectly impacts students as I begin to develop and change the organizational culture to provide much needed and continuous support for increasing and enhancing the skills, attitudes, abilities, experiences, and knowledge of those who may or may not serve students directly. As I review the criteria, particularly for Criterion #1, items 2 and 3, the emphasis seems to be weighted heavier on those programs that directly impact students. For a new program such as mine that is looking to change and improve the institution itself, this work would not be valued because it does not have a direct impact on the students. In a sense, for Criterion #1, there is little support for those programs involved with improving our current organization. At least, under items 2 and 3.

For example, my department can be influential in providing training and support for front office staff as they interact with students. My department's impact is indirect; changing the front office staff to become more customer-service friendly and helpful would be the direct impact to the students. But being a new program, there are no systems in place to measure the impact of the training to the front office staff. Additionally, my department is only responsible for sharing these opportunities to the front office staff to access the training and support. I am not the organization responsible for providing that training to the employees. (At least, not yet.) If I were to use another example, I can set up training on Microsoft Excel so that staff can learn to be more proficient with this particular application to help them in their work. However, it is the IT staff that are responsible for the training and it's effectiveness, not my program.

Additionally, I'm not really sure that the items in Criterion #2 and #3 can be used to measure the efficacy of a program. Let's start with Criterion #2 Quality and Quantity of Resources of the Service. How does the square footage of work space relate to quality and quantity? How does the salary of each employee relate to the efficiency of the quality and quantity of the service? If I were to use my program as an example, I
couldn’t say that my specific salary could be an indicator of whether I am more or less efficient when it comes to the quality and quantity of the service that I provide to employees. It seems very nebulous to try and match them. Would two people in my one position making half as much as myself be more or less efficient? Would my outcomes be better or worse? It’s very difficult to determine just on principle, but even much more difficult when there is no benchmark for measuring this particular item. In my case, since no other campus across the 23 campus system actually has the same program, it would be virtually impossible to determine. And for items 10 - 13 in Criterion #2, I would have a very difficult time trying to come up with any meaningful feedback because, as a new program, I can’t answer them.

Reflecting on the challenges that these criteria have presented me, it seems that many of them can be answered for programs under the auspices of "What is". They don’t necessarily have much meaning for new or emerging programs. In other words, they do not adequately cover for "What can be".

I’m not really complaining. I’m just pointing out a blindspot that is apparent with a new program such as mine. But it could be a bigger blindspot as we look to improve the overall University experience for our students, staff, and community.

Let me close with one more example that may clearly illustrate my point. A little more than ten years ago, this University adopted a learning management system called Blackboard. If you had provided this criteria to faculty, staff, or administrators at the time, it would have scored at or a little more than zero for any criteria. It probably would not have had any support to be adopted because very few people would have understood the impact to teaching/learning. And yet, more than ten years later, it's growth and development has been critical to the mission and success of virtually every student. The same story could be said about email. (Do you know how many faculty were resistant to email when it first came out? Less than four years ago, we had one faculty member who refused to answer email.)

My point is not to pick on faculty or any one group here. It's really to point out that we need to allow room for creativity, risk-taking, collaboration, and the Big X -- the unknown factor that could ultimately improve and enrich the University in ways that we had not originally thought possible.

April 9

I think it will be the rare service on this campus that develops annual goals for either quantity or quality. Questions 14 and 15 should be dropped.

April 10

1) Provide clear, itemized instructions to respondents up front.
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2) Define operationally what a service is.
3) Provide academic department chairs some autonomy about how to combine services as fits a department best.
4) Clearly state that a chair may be responsible for multiple templates being filled out.
5) Start with an open background section so chairs can narratively detail context for all services.
6) Might there be value in having a chair rank order all their services, in terms of essentiality to the program? In the end, chairs know their departments best and it may help readers to know the chair’s priorities.
7) Also ask specifically about what has been cut recently. I’m still surprised how little other departments or administrators know about what has been cut, before you make more cuts, ask chairs what was cut already.

April 11

Hi, I think we need more healthy eating choices on campus. We miss the healthy falafel stand!! The bagel place is the only one that is half-way decent. Also, we need to be more green, need all types of recycle bins in many areas.

Thanks.

April 18

Planning for Distinction? How about planning for a room big enough to accommodate the division. Nothing says welcome like standing room only.

April 18

I have a concern regarding the time line for program chairs to complete their report. I believe that the chairs have to be given all summer to complete these reports. This will created better reports and would not delay the evaluation process that would take place in the fall anyway.

April 19

I have reviewed the drafts and I believe they are very comprehensive and well done. I am looking forward to the results. I can see that there is thoughtful and systematic processes. I have a few suggestions if they please the committee:

Overall: I realize this is a work in progress. Towards completion, one thing that may benefit the CSUEB campus is be transparent in the scoring rubric, not just what would give the highest score, but exactly what the rating system is. Is the rating 1-5 and if so, define exactly what a "1" means, and what a "5" means.
Also: The two criteria for Instructional vs Support Programs on campus’ ratings appear to be pretty different from each other. In particular as it is presented right now, the Instructional Programs criteria seem to have more quantitative criteria and the Support Programs criteria appear to have more qualitative criteria. Perhaps this is due to the where the campus is in the process of this draft.

Regarding the analysis of outcomes:
At the end of the analysis, it would be interesting to determine the global impact of CSUEB on the larger Bay Area community:

1) We address (as part of all strategic commitments):
*After college* (helping students prepare for gainful employment, contribute to their community or reconnect with the university);

*Support the civic, cultural, and economic life of all communities in the regions we serve through partnerships that promote education and social responsibility;*

*Demonstrate our continuing record of leadership and innovation in higher education, focused on 21st century skills, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics...*

While these are very important indicators individually, to address the Regional Stewardship of CSUEB, perhaps the analysis of Planning for Distinction will take these individual strategic commitments and also analyze them together as one factor that impacts the outcomes of CSUEB in the larger community or impact on the CSU system as a whole. The three strategic commitments mentioned above, when ratings are combined into one factor, might be a very interesting predictor of CSUEB’s regional stewardship outcome for CSUEB or the whole CSU system.

The other strategic outcomes address academic quality, campus climate, and accountability. Will the committee analyze these results to determine how these indicators impact the overall outcomes of CSUEB in the Bay Area (i.e., number of CSUEB students’ employed by Bay Area Companies or alumni that are products of specific Academic Departments in CSUEB that make contributions to "21st century skills, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics...")? In California? Nationally? Internationally?

to the Support Program’s Criteria

3) There are Administrative departments on campus that are not faculty that have a highly educated staff and would that add to the distinction of the department?. For example- in the AS department, we have 28 staff/ hourly employees. Approximately 86% of our staff have a BA, MA, or PHD. As is housed in A & F division, however, I would assume that the committee might find similar percentages in other divisions such
as, IT; UA; PEMSA, etc.

4) How will the committee rate/quantify departments with programs that partner with the larger CSUEB community, California, Nationally, or Internationally-may have a larger impact on outcomes and distinction for the university. For example, international exchange programs, Hayward Promised Neighborhoods, Service Learning, etc. In AS, we partner with Department of Rehabilitation (This organization funds tuition, books, housing and program fees for non-mandated services that support retention and graduation for several students in AS department) What partnerships do other departments form with the larger community and how are they valued?

5) Will the analysis of Planning for Distinction qualify or quantify a department's positive social media/online presence?

thanks for your consideration!

April 22

The only comment that I have is to ensure that people have enough time to complete it. It would be unfortunately if people rush to answer these questions.

By taking the right amount of time to answer these questions with quality we will gather a lot of good information about our organization and its services.