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I. Introduction

President Mohammad H. Qayoumi, in his first convocation speech before the university community, proclaimed a new era for California State University, East Bay (CSUEB) and a pivotal moment in the university's history as we approach our fiftieth year in 2007. Envisioning CSUEB in five to ten years as truly extraordinary, he called on us to define that future now.1

Becoming a truly extraordinary institution will require that the CSUEB community reinforce a sense of belonging, solidarity, and common purpose bounded by contractual and business arrangements and defined roles and obligations that sustain and nurture the spirit of a true community. Armed with CSUEB’s mission, values, and vision, the president committed himself to uphold and defend the spirit of our academic community and to protect the integrity of the institution. At the same time, he issued a call to action, stating that we must face a plethora of dynamic economic and market conditions, shifting community needs, and changing student expectations, all of which have combined to produce the increasingly competitive environment in which CSUEB operates today.

1 Mohammad H. Qayoumi, Fall 2006 Faculty and Staff Convocation Address, September 25, 2006, California State University, East Bay. Hayward, CA., online at http://theview.csueastbay.edu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=833&Itemid=75.
Together, we acknowledge that the university has not achieved the regional status or the enrollment envisioned at the time of its charter. With our financial stability threatened and our curricular and academic offerings constrained, the president has outlined three priorities for the university: enrollment growth and management; financial stability; and increasing the number of tenured faculty.

President Qayoumi has emphasized that our survival and eventual successes will depend upon a willingness to manifest our pioneer spirit; to push fearlessly into confusing, volatile, and uncharted frontiers; and to accept and share responsibility for planning and creating our future. This will require insightful and ambitious long-term goals tied to specific objectives, timelines, budgets, and resources, as well as decision-making processes, annual planning, and accountability. Thus, the president has called for university planning that is clearly linked to evidence and aligned with university priorities. Together, these standards and actions will enable us to use our resources wisely and efficiently — and achieve our vision.

President Qayoumi launched his strategic planning process by calling for the voices, values, and visions of the university community in a series of town hall meetings designed to identify and incorporate our collective aspirations and strategic priorities. Through 21 town hall meetings conducted in October and November 2006, with more than 1,500 comments from more than 600 participants, seven clear mandates emerged. These mandates provide intentional choices for the university and serve as a roadmap to our future.

This report presents the first phase of this process and represents a community-based framework for creating and planning the university’s future. As such, it serves three broad purposes. The first is to describe the methodology for achieving a collective vision through the town hall process, including content analysis of the comments and the results that characterize each of the seven community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Methodology, results, and themes from Town Hall Meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Situation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Next Steps: Implementation and Accountability Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mandates. The second purpose is to provide a background of evidence and a situation analysis. Third, this report sets forth the next steps, together with guidelines for implementation and accountability.

II. Creating a Collective Vision: Methodology and Results.

*How do you generate a shared vision and pathway to CSUEB’s future wherein the entire university community is committed and willing to take responsibility for shaping that future through actions?*

On October 6, 2006, President Qayoumi, in his monthly column in *The View*, CSUEB’s online employee newsletter, stated: “While we may feel uncertain about the future, the most reliable way to predict it is to create it. By accepting joint responsibility, we have, in fact, committed ourselves to action – and we must now follow through with plans. The first step in this process involves creating a framework for envisioning the future of our institution. It also requires engaging all of our constituents in an inclusive and open dialogue. This begins immediately, with a series of university town hall meetings.”

Thus began the university’s 21 town hall meetings.

**Town Hall Meetings: Protocols and Process**

Each one-hour town hall session focused on a discussion of four key questions:

- What are the core values of CSUEB?
- What makes CSUEB distinctive, and what are our points of pride, key strengths, and most important assets?
- How would you envision or describe Cal State East Bay five years from now and 10 years from now?
- What should be CSUEB’s most important short-term (5-year) and long-term (10-year) priorities? What needs to be addressed, and which assets and strengths should we cultivate, expand, and build upon?

---

2 M. Qayoumi; “President Urges Town Hall Attendance,” *The View*, October 6, 2006; online at https://theview.csueastbay.edu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=859&Itemid=76.
The president attended each meeting, listened, and spoke briefly only at the end to thank participants and let them know the next steps. A moderator facilitated the discussion, and a recorder both took notes and, after the allotted time for participants to respond to each question, read them aloud the notes so that the audience could correct or confirm the interpretation. These notes were made available online (http://www.csueastbay.edu/townhallnotes/index.html), and all attendees were encouraged to continue the dialogue online.

The more than 1,500 comments from the 21 face-to-face meetings with approximately 600 participants, together with online comments, were carefully content analyzed by the two people who had been the moderator and recorder for most of the sessions. Together, they considered, analyzed, and sorted each comment according to similarity, which initially created 23 categories, or “comment streams.” These categories were then clustered into seven overarching outcomes representing the mandates that the university constituents felt must be accomplished. Following each mandate, listed below, is a bulleted list of indicators and actionable goals suggested or inspired by town hall participants and their comments as ways to help CSUEB actualize the mandates.

**An Efficient, Well-Run University with a Culture of Accountability.** We must create, sustain, and reward a culture of excellence, efficiency, accountability, and continuous quality improvement — "a university that works" — as a requirement for survival as well as the foundation for growth and future success. Among the areas of foremost concern to the campus community are the following needs and priorities:

- Streamline all business processes and procedures to provide fast, flexible, friendly service.
- Implement a business model ensuring financial stability and sustainability.

---

3 Providing participants the opportunity to hear how their comments are being translated and being allowed to correct and/or confirm that translation is often referred to in ethnographic research manuals as “contextual validity”.
4 See Appendix A for the original 23 “comment stream” categories and coding totals.
5 See Appendix B for the comment stream/community mandates cluster analysis.
• Deliver consistent, reliable, responsive enrollment and student services from recruitment and admissions to advising, mentoring, retention, career development, and beyond.
• Restore and maintain a physical plant that is consistently attractive, clean, safe, easily accessible, and green.
• Improve transportation and physical access — to, from, and on campus.
• Update information systems and infrastructure.
• Properly train, develop, equip, and compensate all employees.
• Reward professionalism, competency, and earnest customer-service.
• Insist upon accountability and transparency.

_**Strong Growth and Full Enrollment with Personalized Learning and Expanded Access.**_

We must aggressively grow and strategically manage our enrollment, benefiting all of our campuses and locations, while increasing access for students from all backgrounds and also strengthening our hallmark personalized learning/teaching environment. _Among the areas of foremost concern to the campus community are the following needs and priorities:_

• Grow and manage admissions and enrollments.
• Achieve a balanced enrollment with appropriate and healthy mix of first-time freshmen, transfers, upper division and graduate students.
• Promote the benefits of attending CSUEB aggressively, creatively, and consistently.
• Increase access and affordability for students of all backgrounds.
• Manage scheduling of classes to satisfy student needs and expectations.
• Expand, renew, and update curriculum and pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning that will meet changing societal and market needs.
• Broaden access and meet changing student needs and preferences with online learning.
• Increase our visibility and collaboration with the community colleges, high and middle schools.
• Recruit more intensively for students in surrounding communities as well as throughout the state.
**Vibrant University Villages.** We must plan, develop, and build the infrastructure for a lively, vibrant, and sustainable "University Village" at each of our campuses, where “24/7” facilities and activities promote the quality of life and well-being of students, faculty, and staff, as well as surrounding communities. Among the infrastructure, activity, and campus-life additions of foremost interest to the campus community are:

- New and expanded housing options for faculty, staff, and students
- A state-of-the-art recreational/sports center as campus activity centerpiece
- Greatly increased arts, entertainment, and athletics programming with consistent promotion
- More cafes/food service options representative of our diverse students, faculty, and staff
- Multicultural and women’s centers
- A welcoming, convenient, and centralized student advising center
- A commuter center with commuter-appropriate programming
- Expanded health and well-being venues, as well as activities that attract the participation and enhance the quality of life of surrounding communities
- A master plan with provisions for a new "signature" structure, such as a bell tower

**An Inclusive Campus Climate that Values Students, Faculty, and Staff, and Fosters Multicultural Learning and Competence.** We value and insist upon a campus climate characterized by a welcoming, inclusive, and caring atmosphere, responsive to the unique needs of all community members — a campus climate where multicultural competence, global perspectives, and learning experiences infuse our curriculum, policies, and practices. Among the areas of foremost values, principles, and objectives of the campus community are:

- Dedication to open-minded inquiry and vigorous debate of social and global issues
- Commitment to ethical and transparent decision processes
- An infusion of multicultural competence and learning experiences, as well as a global perspectives, throughout the curriculum, co-curriculum, policies, and practices
- Consistent recruitment, hiring, promotion, and compensation practices for faculty and staff.
- Robust professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and students
- Institutional self-esteem grounded in pride in the students, faculty, and staff
• Full-spectrum diversity and multiculturalism (e.g., race, culture, gender, sexual orientation, age/generation, physical abilities, social-economic class.)

• Climate of earnest collaboration

• Demonstrable appreciation of the faculty, students, and staff for their service and abiding commitment in pursuit of CSUEB’s mission

• Activities that promote student, faculty, and staff interaction, enjoyment, and well-being

_A Tradition of Teaching, Learning, and Academic Quality — Emphasized and Reinforced._

Our core mission of teaching, learning, and commitment to the success of students of all backgrounds must be honored, reinforced, and reflected through our academic programs, practices, and faculty — and understood as the measure by which our quality is defined and judged. _Among the areas of foremost concern to the campus community are the following needs and priorities:_

• Invest in faculty quality by increasing the numbers of tenure-track faculty and improving the ratio of tenure-track and tenured faculty to lecturers.

• Preserve and strengthen our hallmark personalized teaching and learning environment, even as we grow.

• Support a sustainable structure for faculty curriculum development and research, scholarship, and creative activities that benefit teaching and learning.

• Encourage and reward faculty to serve a broader role, beyond the classroom, as career mentors and “launchers,” more fully meeting student expectations.

• Deliver on our "Students First" pledge: If we accept them, we must work to retain and support them all the way through graduation and beyond.

• Renew, expand, and support course development, and academic programs as required to remain relevant.

• Respond to evolving student and regional needs with innovative academic programming and internships

• Expand online and technology assisted programs, teaching, and learning.

_Our Quest for Distinction Realized._ We must identify, develop, cultivate, and invest in the programs, features, and aspects of a CSUEB education we wish to be known for, and we must
promote them consistently and creatively. Among the areas of foremost concern to the campus community are the following needs, expectations, and goals:

- Invest more in faculty excellence, by which the quality of a CSUEB education is often judged.
- Ensure all constituents, internally and externally, are "on message" and know why to choose CSUEB and what differentiates CSUEB from other choices—a critical competitive matter.
- Plan, act, and communicate to all constituents with clarity and precision about CSUEB "target markets."
- Make strategic decisions about which programs to invest in, build reputation upon, and promote, guided by our mission and our "place" in the region and the marketplace.
- Aggressively and strategically promote faculty quality and engagement in regional issues, as well as key programs and outcomes (alumni success stories).
- Build reputation and affinity regionally by responding to community needs with distinctive new programs—but be prepared for "start-up investments" and strong promotion.
- Reinforce and promote our Freshman Learning Communities, which are garnering a national reputation.
- Do "a better job of getting the word out," with more advertising, marketing, publicity, and outreach to/involvement in schools—with CSUEB information available "in all schools."
- Invest in and build a reputation for information and technology literacy, online learning, and learning technologies.

**University of Choice through Regional Stewardship.** Our goal is to be widely recognized as the East Bay's "own CSU" and the region's high-access public university of choice by building visibility, affinity, and support through greatly increased community and regional service, engagement, and leadership. Among the areas of foremost concern to the campus community are the following needs, expectations, and goals:

- Regional engagement and stewardship defines our role and relationships with the communities of the East Bay.
Regional stewardship is consistent with our mission, vision, values statement.
Recognize, capitalize upon, and deliver on CSUEB's natural regional role (stewardship) as the key to its reputation and distinctiveness — "Make our name real."
Reflect our regional stewardship role and commitment with innovative leadership, research, grants, contracts, and specializations (e.g., an East Bay urban institute)
Influence the quality of life and futures of the communities we serve by our programs and activities.
Nurture our host-city relationships including Hayward, Oakland, and Concord.
Strengthen our position with stronger reciprocal relationships with local and regional business/industrial, educational, professional, social/social service, arts and cultural organizations.

III. Situation Analysis and Background

What data and historic facts support and legitimate the university community’s call to action as expressed in the seven town hall meeting mandates, and what is the background to the situation in which the university finds itself?

Driving the need for a comprehensive long-range strategic plan at CSUEB are conditions unique to the institution. The observations, views, and aspirations for the future of CSUEB expressed by the university community at the president’s town hall meetings not only reflect a strong, shared awareness of these conditions, but are also corroborated by a review of historical facts and institutional research findings.

Thus, this planning process aims to build upon a shared awareness of the university’s core values and unique characteristics, its distinctive strengths and opportunities, and the very real needs and serious challenges it faces. The university community also clearly recognized in the tone and

6 The mission, vision, values statement adopted by CSUEB in 2004 calls for it to be "socially responsible contributors to their communities locally and globally," and also proclaims, “We value engagement in economic, civic, cultural, and economic life of communities we serve...”); online at http://www.csueastbay.edu/about/president/mission.html.
content of its town hall meeting discussions that success requires an honest and open 
examination of institutional weaknesses and threats.

The information presented in this background section is intended to provide a historical, fact-
based context for the university community’s town hall meeting mandates. This information 
also confirms and validates the university community’s observations and concerns — and 
legitimates their vision, priorities, and call to action as mandates. When this background information is correlated and considered together with the mandates, six key areas of focus, challenge, and opportunity emerge for CSUEB:

- Managing its enrollment
- Embracing its unique role as a regional steward while building and promoting a distinctive image as such
- Cultivating a vibrant and self-sustaining campus community
- Renewing its academic offerings to meet changing competitive and constituent needs
- Defining and rewarding a culture of achievement, accountability, and effective communication.
- Maintaining a clean, safe, attractive physical environment.

**Enrollment**

In contrast to growth in the region it serves, CSUEB enrollment has remained relatively stagnant for the past three and one-half decades. State Departments of Finance and Education documents supporting the 1957 legislation that constituted the university, as well as the university’s original master plan, Blueprint for the Future, which was approved by the state Department of Education, called for the Hayward campus to serve 25,000 students. The

---

7 The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Analytic Studies, *CSU Statistical Abstracts*, Long Beach CA.

The university’s current master plan calls for an enrollment of 18,000. The current strategic plan for the university’s Concord Campus calls for another 10,000 students. Yet, today, CSUEB enrollment is approximately 12,700, roughly the same as it was in the early 1970’s.

If the university’s enrollment had simply kept pace with growth in its market area, more than 18,000 students would be attending CSUEB today. It would be hard to overemphasize the difference this would make in the institution’s financial strength. Its budget would increase by an estimated $42 million. CSUEB also could have qualified for as much as $300 million for new facilities construction and renovation of existing facilities. And as a result, its ability to address its many academic programming, student services, faculty and staff hiring, compensation, infrastructure investment, and other needs would be vastly different than it is today.

As a further indication of the need to manage its enrollment, the university’s enrollment mix is also out of balance with the highest ratios of upper division to lower division students in the California State University (CSU) system. At the same time, while several of the other CSU campuses have been impacted, having achieved enrollment capacity, CSUEB has not reached its full potential and planned enrollment. Moreover, the university appears to have lost market share as local CSU-bound high school students increasingly choose direct competitors over CSUEB.

---

9 CSUEB Office of Facilities Planning and Management; Master Plan for California State University, Hayward.
10 California State University, Hayward, Strategic Master Plan for California State University, Hayward, Contra Costa Campus, 1995; online at http://www.concord.csueastbay.edu/strategicplan.htm.
11 The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Analytic Studies, CSU Statistical Abstracts, Long Beach CA.
12 M. Qayoumi, “Enrollment is Key,” The View, September 6, 2006; online at http://theview.csueastbay.edu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=797&Itemid=76.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
15 CSUEB’s 74:26 upper/lower division student ratio violates standards for a healthy, sustainable university as established by the CSU, California Post-Secondary Education Commission, and the California State Educational Code; all of which call for a 60:40 upper division/lower division ratio. CSUEB’s current ratio is 80:20 (CSUEB, Office of Institutional Research & Assessment, Overall Headcount Enrollment Profile, online at http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/tables/FallHeadcountEnrollment/Fall.Headcount.Enrollment.1-1.pdf). In addition, although in the university’s own 1998 goals called for a 75:25 undergraduate/post-baccalaureate ratio with graduate enrollment at 25% (Goals II Committee, University Goals and Objectives, online at: http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/Goals&Objectives.pdf), its current ratio is 73:27, with graduate enrollment at 19% (CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment, Overall Headcount Enrollment Profile.)
In the past, university administrators had periodically reaffirmed enrollment objectives and also adopted corollary goals calling for increasing enrollment by at least two to three percent or more annually; rebalancing enrollment to achieve a 60:40 upper division/lower division ratio; improving student experience and retention; and maintaining a graduate population of 25% of total enrollment.17 These objectives not only require a clear emphasis on undergraduate and first-time freshman recruiting, but also a structured plan to achieve them.

**Institutional Image and Role as Regional Steward**

As the university seeks enrollment increases, particularly among traditional-aged students, it needs a strong foundation of respect and value among those in the surrounding communities who would be expected to know of it. Moreover, as the university prepares to compete for students even more broadly in communities throughout California, it will face even less constituent awareness. Thus, the need for CSUEB to build institutional awareness among local audiences while also establishing a presence in new markets is critical.

Prior to its name change, the university’s image had become commodity-like (chosen based solely on low pricing), versus brand-like (desired and chosen based on distinctiveness and perceived value), as a result of not having invested in and managed its image consistently and strategically. Research conducted in 1998 and 2002, for instance, showed that awareness of the university among residents of the region was not only low but also declining.18 Except for a nascent sense of regional affinity based on the name change, university research conducted between 2000 and 2005 also revealed that few consistently strong images of the institution emerge among its East Bay constituents and most important audiences, college-bound students and their parents.19 Other than friendly, convenient, and accessible — and with minimal associations with academic

---

17 Goals II Committee, *University Goals and Objectives*
18 Gail Straus, *Executive Summary of Research Findings: CSUH Image Perception Research (Socratic Technologies)*, Lipman Hearne, Inc., Chicago, IL, March 2003, referring to a comparison between:
   (a) Socratic Technologies, Inc., Lipman Hearne, Inc., CSUH Office of Institutional Research & Assessment, CSUH University Marketing Communications, *California State University, Hayward Image Perception Research*, Hayward, CA, March 2003; and
quality, prestige, or campus life — CSUEB’s image and reputation places it at a disadvantage as it competes with peer institutions for students, friends, and financial support.\textsuperscript{20}

Following the university's 2005 name change, research among East Bay college-bound students and parents of college-bound students not only showed an increase in awareness, but also indications of improved quality perceptions.\textsuperscript{21} While only about one-third of 2002 survey respondents regarded California State University, Hayward, as the university was formerly known, equivalent to San Francisco State University (SFSU) and San Jose State University (SJSU), in the 2005 survey, 69% rated CSUEB as equivalent to — or better than — SFSU, and 76% rated CSUEB as equivalent to — or better than — SJSU. Moreover, a majority of college-bound students respondents agreed that CSUEB was “attended by “students like me,” and a majority of parents respondents agreed that CSUEB was attended by “students like my child.”\textsuperscript{22}

This shift in institutional perception points to a key opportunity for CSUEB to build a new, more valuable and distinctive image as the regional institution of choice. Now on the verge of expanded enrollment and development/fundraising initiatives, the criticality of more robust and strategic marketing and image management is self-apparent — as is the corollary need to deliver on the stewardship promise and commitment enunciated by the institution's name.

Vibrant and Self-Sustaining Campus Community

Among the most fervent aspirations for the future of CSUEB enunciated at the town hall meetings was a shared vision for a vibrant and self-sustaining campus community, described by one participant as a "university village." This vision comprises two essential, interdependent — and interactive — elements, campus life and campus climate.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Comparison of results from (a.) 2005 awareness, image, and perception testing (Socratic Technologies, Inc., \textit{Cal State East Bay Image Testing Topline Report}, San Francisco, CA, September 2005) and (b.) 2002 awareness, image, and perception testing (Socratic Technologies, Inc., and other, CSUH University Marketing Communications, \textit{California State University, Hayward Image Perception Research}, Hayward, CA, March 2003)
Campus life has long been an area of concern of the campus community, shared by university units and affiliates including its Student Affairs Division and Associated Students, Inc. Admitted student research shows that, compared to competing institutions, CSUEB earns lower ratings for key "campus life" indicators, including access to off-campus activities, extra-curricular opportunities, quality of social life, quality of campus housing, and availability of recreational facilities. While these factors are not among the most important to the non-traditional student population to which CSUEB has historically catered — and therefore not the primary reasons why CSUEB loses students — they are more important to non-enrolling admitted students than to enrolling students. This suggests that CSUEB may lose some prospective students who do not find the campus particularly appealing or lively.

External community awareness and perceptual research conducted between 1998 and 2004, together with 2006 campus climate research, adds to the evidence of widely shared perception — among both internal as well as external constituents — that CSUEB is "a commuter college," not much different than a community college, with "no life" and not much happening except classes. Moreover, even though CSUEB offers a wide array of co-curricular activities on campus, only about 15% of matriculated students indicate they are actively involved in out-of-class campus life, with more than half not at all active.

Campus climate, which encompasses relational expressions of the university's life, is an integral and equally important component of the CSUEB experience. The university's statement of mission, vision, and values describes the campus climate to which the university aspires as an exemplar of a multicultural learning experience for students. It further defines this culture as diversified faculty, staff, and student body who are multiculturally competent; curricular and co-curricular opportunities that foster multicultural perspectives and skills; and a climate

---

23 Applied Educational Research, Inc., Admitted Student Questionnaires — California State University, Hayward — (i.) First-Time Freshmen; (ii.) Transfers, and (iii), Graduate Students; The College Board, Reston, VA, 2000, 2002, and 2004.
24 Ibid.
25 (a.) Ibid; and (b.) Lipman Hearne, Inc., Executive Summary: Using Research to Understand Perceptions of California State University, Hayward, Chicago, II., November 2002.
characterized by respect, inclusion, and academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students from all backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives.

CSUEB enjoys one of the most diverse student bodies of the CSUs and also compares favorably with the other CSUs in retention and graduation rates. However, similar to other U.S. universities, CSUEB's African-Americans and Latino males graduate at a lower rate than all other ethnic groups, with African American males having the lowest retention and graduation rate.

With respect to faculty diversity, the WASC visiting team found that it was not consistent with CSUEB's student population, and that CSUEB had not developed the organizational capacity to focus on the recruitment and retention of an ethnically diverse faculty. Although the University has a policy in place to attract diverse faculty it has not yet adopted the most effective practices to increase the diversity of faculty who make career commitments to CSUEB. The WASC Commission letter concluded that "while the University’s hiring places it ahead of CSU averages, CSUEB has not yet made diversity recruitment a hallmark." CSUEB faces a similar challenge in recruiting and retaining a diverse staff across all classifications.

The WASC Commission, commenting on the establishment of multiculturalism as a key value or cornerstone of the educational experience at CSUEB, concluded, "… more needs to be done to demonstrate it as a reality throughout the institution." The 2006 Campus Climate Survey further identified gaps between the university's vision and the experience of its students, faculty, and staff. It points out, for example, that while most CSUEB students feel they are treated respectfiully and fairly, they are split regarding whether "CSUEB creates good student morale." Most staff members, on the other hand, consider CSUEB "a good place to work," but many are concerned about whether meritorious performance is recognized, pay is equitable, and

---

27 CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment data, online at http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira.
28 Ibid.
29 Western Association of Schools & Colleges (WASC), Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges & Universities, Report of the WASC Visiting Team; Capacity and Preparatory Review to California State University East Bay; 16- 18 March 2005; online at http://www.csueastbay.edu/wasc/pdfs/CSUEB Team Report (2).pdf
30 WASC Letter to President Norma S. Rees, President, California State University, East Bay, June 30, 2005, online at http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/wasc_letter.pdf.
31 Ibid.
32 CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment, Campus Climate Survey, 2006.
information sharing and decision-making is sufficiently transparent or open. Faculty members rate their professional relationships with colleagues and departments highly, as they do academic freedom and intellectual inquiry at CSUEB. However, with their concerns about teaching load, class size, and earnest shared governance, three-quarters do not agree that faculty morale is good.

With CSUEB poised to broaden the scope of its student profile to include more traditional and residential students, its combined campus life and culture attributes are likely to assume a much more prominent role, for together they define the core of the CSUEB college experience. Research into the preferences and life-views of the nation's current college-bound generation, the "Millennials," reveals that the quality and distinctiveness of the college experience is a dominant factor in their college-choice decisions. Thus, in order to realize its preeminent strategic objectives and vision — grow enrollment, become a destination university, and garner a reputation as the regional public university of choice — CSUEB must make improved quality of campus life and climate a top priority. At the same time, the university's tradition of serving a highly diverse student body heightens its responsibility to model a truly welcoming and earnestly inclusive and respectful campus community.

**Opportunities for Academic Expansion & Renewal**

Of the attributes by which the standing of a university may be measured, academic quality is among the foremost. Academic quality plays an essential role in the college choices made by prospective students, the recommendations of their influencers, the financial support decisions of prospective friends and donors, and even the votes of citizens and lawmakers. The critical markers of academic quality include the relevancy and currency of the university’s degree programs, the expertise and mentoring abilities of the faculty, and the effectiveness of the support staff.

33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
Academic quality depends in part on sufficient numbers of expert faculty. CSUEB's faculty members have earned their doctoral degrees at a range of distinguished universities in the U.S. and abroad. In the CSU, faculty staffing depends on state support and student enrollment — and for CSUEB these elements have been declining for several years due to state budget cuts and enrollment target shortfalls. Some programs (especially those in high demand) have difficulty offering enough sections to serve the students. Over the past eight years, (Fall 1999 to Winter 2007) the number of tenure track faculty (FTEF) declined 9%, from 346.1 to 313.4. This decline in FTEF resulted in a 14% increase of lecturers from 176.5 in 1999 to 201.4 in 2007. Thus the ratio of part-time (31%) to tenure track faculty (61%) is now eight percentage points higher than it was ten years ago. In September 2001, the Legislature adopted a resolution (ACR 73), which urged the board of Trustees to raise the percentage of tenure-track faculty to at least 75%. While the Legislature has not appropriated funds to implement this goal, CSUEB’s faculty have been especially challenged by both internally generated and externally imposed constraints due to multi-year budget cuts. CSUEB has fewer faculty to accomplish its mission. Our students are limited by the reduction in course offerings.

Evaluating the excellence and reputation of the curriculum and degree programs has long been the responsibility of the faculty. CSUEB has a history of program review processes using the faculty academic senate Committee for Academic Planning and Review (CAPR). These processes include essential measures such as comparisons with corresponding programs in the CSU system and nationally, as well as the reputation of faculty in their disciplines. In addition to these critical CAPR criteria, other considerations have also emerged that impinge upon perceptions of university academic reputation and must also be addressed.

36 CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment data.
37 Ibid.
38 California State Legislature, ACR 73, September 26, 2001, online at http://www.legislature.ca.gov/cgi-bin/port-postquery?bill_number=acr_73&sess=0102&house=B&author=strom-martin
39 Ibid.
In spring of 2006, the Academic Senate approved an extensive revision to its program review process. In addition to academic-specific measures, it endeavors to envisage curricular changes in coming years. Reviews must now stipulate whether new programs or outreach to new student populations is anticipated, whether new career opportunities for graduates will open during the next five years, and how the program will adjust its curriculum and program practices to prepare students for those changes. The opportunity before CSUEB is to engage wholeheartedly in an expansive and forward-looking academic review and renewal process that includes an earnest willingness to adjust to the changing needs, expectations, and preferences of its students, communities, and the market in which it competes.

Today, students and influencers, as well as institutional friends and donors, are key arbiters — and CSUEB student and market research paints a mixed picture. On one hand, matriculated students rate university faculty and the classroom experience they provide positively. On the other hand, among the college characteristics considered "very important" by prospective students, CSUEB rates lower than its competitors in various measures or indicators of academic quality, including academic reputation, quality of academic facilities, quality of majors, availability of majors, and value for the price. Community research corroborates this troubling perceptual gap by showing that while college-bound high school students and their parents/guardians rate CSUEB highly on convenience, affordability, and diversity, they disagree that it “is academically challenging,” or “offers the quality programs in which I am/my college-aged child is/interested.”

CSUEB's pragmatic, career-motivated students equate earning a degree with developing the skills needed for jobs, report only moderate interest in a broad general education, and feel they are not
exposed to relevant coursework as early in their CSUEB college careers as expected.\textsuperscript{44} They give faculty high marks for in-class teaching and course preparation, but some are less satisfied with faculty beyond the classroom — as professional mentors and career launchers.\textsuperscript{45}

The Campus Climate Survey also revealed uncertain student satisfaction with the variety and frequency of course offerings.\textsuperscript{46} Moreover, there is evidence linking decreased availability of class sections with enrollment weaknesses, such as a precipitous drop in summer 2004-quarter attendance enrollment.\textsuperscript{47} At the same time, research suggests a growing, unmet demand for alternative learning and instructional modes, including more online classes.\textsuperscript{48} Thus, in addition to ensuring the currency and efficacy of its offerings, CSUEB must recognize that mode and availability are equally important — especially to the non-traditional student population it has cultivated, which values convenience much more than "college experience."

Administrative staff play a pivotal role in supporting the academic quality of an institution. Staff and other resources in the library, instructional technology, student services and nearly every part of the university have been cut, resulting in reduced levels of service.\textsuperscript{49} Staff reductions, due to layoffs and reassignments have affected the quantity and timeliness of services. Between 2002 and the present, there was a 15% decrease in non-executive, administrative and support staff.\textsuperscript{50} Between 2002-2005, the Division of Student Affairs budget was reduced by over $1.5 million, requiring cutbacks in essential services such as advising.\textsuperscript{51} Inaccessible and inadequate services due to increased demand and decreased staffing has not only taxed the capabilities and morale of

\textsuperscript{44} Lipman Heane, Inc., \textit{Executive Summary: Using Research to Understand Perceptions of California State University, Hayward}, Chicago, IL, November 2002.
\textsuperscript{45} CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment, \textit{Campus Climate Survey}, 2006, revealed that 31.4% of student respondents disagreed that their departments help graduates find employment.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid. Survey revealed that 20% of student respondents rated the frequency with which required classes are offered as poor, 29% rated it as fair, and 38% rated the variety of offerings as fair to poor.
\textsuperscript{47} CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment data.
\textsuperscript{48} CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment, \textit{Campus Climate Survey}, 2006, revealed that 31.4% of student respondents disagreed that their departments help graduates find employment.
\textsuperscript{49} WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, CSUH.
\textsuperscript{50} CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment data.
\textsuperscript{51} CSUEB Office of Student Affairs budget data.
a highly committed staff, but if continued will also have negative effect on student persistence and progression toward degree completion.\textsuperscript{52}

Together, these findings provide insights into the reasons why CSUEB loses prospective students and why matriculated students express uncertain satisfaction. They also illustrate how seemingly disparate factors interrelate and converge to shape critical perceptions of academic offerings and quality. Some of the perceptual challenges surrounding academic quality and standing (prestige) that CSUEB faces may be due to a failure to communicate its strengths effectively — a lack of "brand investment." Others reflect the forthright judgements of students, the community, and the marketplace. Thus, CSUEB must determine which perceptual gaps are real, which it chooses to address, and which are already being addressed but not marketed or communicated effectively to key constituencies.

\textbf{Culture of Transparency, Achievement, Accountability, and Effective Communication}

While the university, historically, has demonstrated that it knows how to set goals and refer to them in published documents, it has been unable accomplish its goals in a consistent and systematic way. Until very recently, the budgeting process was also not accessible to most of the administrative and faculty leaders.\textsuperscript{53} With no established or accountable link between budgeting and planning, the achievement of goals has been thwarted. With no integrated plan for implementation and accountability, the university has been unable to sustain and grow its infrastructure and capacity. And without effective lines of communication and coordination, CSUEB has not maintained accurate information flow and effective decision-making.\textsuperscript{54}

This situation became exceedingly apparent in 2005 when the WASC Visiting Team found an unclear level of commitment, ineffective channels of communication, and limited experience with strategic indicators. They concluded that, as a result, the university could not know what is working, where best to invest resources to accomplish its goals, and whether the current

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report}, California State University, Hayward.

\textsuperscript{53} Since the 2003 establishment of the Committee on Budgeting and Resource Allocation (COBRA) by the Academic Senate, the budgeting process at CSUEB is generally regarded as increasingly transparent.

\textsuperscript{54} WASC Visiting Team Report, April 2005, cited in letter from WASC Commission, June 20, 2005.
structures foster organizational communications that “...are clear, consistent with its purpose, and sufficient to support effective decision making.”\textsuperscript{55}

Historical weaknesses regarding transparency, accountability, achievement, and effective communication at CSUEB has multiple negative effects. Not only does it undercut the institution’s capacity to function optimally, but it also stands in the way of becoming "a university that works" for all of its constituents — a leading university mandate.

**Up-To-Date, Clean, and Safe Physical Plant**

At the town hall meetings, the CSUEB community expressed disappointment with the deterioration of the university's physical plant — an outgrowth of its lack of effective organizational structures for ensuring continual improvement, exacerbated by limited resources. Participants echoed the concerns of both internal and external constituents that, as a result of years of deferred maintenance, the appearance of both campuses suffers from unkempt landscaping, building exteriors, walkways and common areas, roadways, parking areas, and campus entrances that not only fail to express pride but, in some instances, also pose safety concerns. At the same time, outdated classrooms and other facilities with inappropriate or worn furniture and equipment as well as poorly maintained restrooms depress the learning experience for students and faculty alike. The overall cleanliness, upkeep, and appearance of the CSUEB physical plant, as rated by faculty, students and staff on the Campus Climate Survey, was unacceptably low.\textsuperscript{56}

In a recent white paper on the need for university facilities to respond to "the changing landscape of higher education," thought-leaders forecasted the conditions and priorities for university building program and updating of the physical plans. \textsuperscript{57} They note that increased competition for students coupled with a growing demand for online programs makes it imperative that universities build, maintain, and marry both high-profile physical facilities with highly developed

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{56} CSUEB Institutional Research & Assessment, *Campus Climate Survey*, 2006.
\textsuperscript{57} Elizabeth Landay, *University Facilities Respond to the Changing Landscape of Higher Education*, APPA Whitepaper, November 6, 2006.
technology and 24/7 services. This suggests that it will be necessary for CSUEB classrooms and laboratories to accommodate a sea change in teaching strategies.

The borders between the university and its neighbors are becoming increasingly permeable, intensifying the responsibility of the university to collaborate with surrounding neighborhoods and cities on land and infrastructure expansions and shared conditions such as traffic. Finally, all aspects of the physical plants associated with the university need to develop energy-efficient strategies that will reduce utilities costs and benefit the environment. They also must be continually assessed and updated, and they must raise its standards for safety and security, in order to meet the needs and expectations of today's students.58

Gary L. Reynolds, P.E., director of Facilities Services at Colorado College, and David Cain, Ph.D., vice president, Carter & Burgess, Inc., studied the impact of facilities on recruitment and retention, in the largest study of its kind.59 They noted that students, nationally, care most about facilities in their major, the library, technology, classrooms, and the residence halls. And while campus facilities, in general, don’t make the top five characteristics that most impact student selection to attend a college, students do, in fact, "rule out" a campus if facilities are inadequate, missing, or poorly kept.60 Nationally, 61% of enrolled students rate physical campus facilities as excellent or very good and 79% strongly agree or agree that they are pleased with the facilities on their campus.61 CSUEB students — as well as faculty and staff — accord the university's physical plant lower ratings, according to some 2006 Campus Climate Survey Measures. This concern extends beyond internal constituencies to the community and prospective students, who accord the university lower scores than competing institutions on the quality of academic facilities.62 Thus, research findings corroborate the campus community's belief that a well-maintained, safe,
and up-to-date physical plant is a requirement for successful recruitment, retention, and student satisfaction — as well as perhaps the most visible expressions of university pride and brand.

IV. Next Steps, Implementation Guidelines & Accountability

What are the priorities, who will be responsible, and how will we know we are making progress towards meeting our goals?

In his September 2006 convocation speech, President Qayoumi stated, “Successful implementation will depend upon three key processes:

- a people process,
- a strategy process, and
- an operations process.”

To ensure success, these processes must be clearly integrated. This means we must align university activities with our priorities. Further, in order to transform our vision into reality, we must execute our plan with unwavering focus and discipline.

Another key ingredient of implementing our strategic plan is synchronization – namely, understanding that we are an organization of interdependent units with the responsibility to link objectives to the university community’s mandates. In other words we must take a systemic approach in our efforts. Our success will be determined by how well we align unit goals, plans, and actions with university mandates.

Given the above, an outline of our next steps are as follows:

---

63 M. Qayoumi, Fall 2006 Faculty and Staff Convocation Address, referring to Larry Bossidy, Ram Charan, and Charles Burck; Execution: The Discipline of Getting Things Done, (Random House, 2005).
This winter quarter, 2007, the university divisions will work together to develop a university-wide implementation plan that includes initial goals for each of the seven mandates along with measures, targets, and benchmarks for the next five years. Then, the divisions will develop the action plans for each of the goals for the next fiscal year. These action plans will also serve as the basis for preparing budget requests that support the common goals and reflect supporting relationships among the divisions. In the following years, during winter quarter, the divisions will report on their performance in the prior year and work together again to update their action plans so that the university can make appropriate adjustments in our strategic investments. These reports will be available for campus community and key stakeholders.

The importance of precisely aligning the university mandates with our plans, actions, and budgets cannot be overemphasized. Moreover, holding ourselves clearly accountable for these connections — and the results — is the only way we can be sure of significant progress toward the future we have envisioned.

Concluding Comments

This report summarizes the initial phase of the university’s strategic planning and implementation initiative, which was conducted to establish a community consensus-based framework for the work that lies ahead. Thus, this reports presents a framework for the future.

The details of the process leading up to the emergence of seven community mandates was presented. The historical facts and research data were analyzed and found to inform and support the seven mandates. And, finally, the basic structure of the implementation and accountability of the mandates, which will guide phase two, was outlined.

In the words of President Qayoumi, the mandates presented in this phase one report "represent the dream we have envisioned together — and the vision we must now work to make real. Not only do they express your expectations of my administration, but also the future for which you have committed to work."\(^\text{64}\)

\(^{\text{64}}\) M. Qayoumi, Next Steps for a New CSUEB, December 8, 2006, online at http://theview.csueastbay.edu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=986&Itemid=76
### APPENDIX "A"

**TOWN HALL MEETINGS COMMENT STREAM CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Choice — Reputation, Image, Visibility, Regional Place/Role/Stewardship/1st Choice, Destination, Pride in/as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Enrollment &amp; Student Services including Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Enrollment Growth &amp; Management including all CSUEB Campuses and Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Financial Stability &amp; Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Campus Climate including Internal Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Physical Plant including Quality of, and Pride in Appearance, Maintenance, and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Faculty — Pride in, and Health of, including Faculty Support, Development, Compensation, PRT, Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Academic Programs — Quality, Reputation, &amp; Renewal including New/Updated/Expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Campus Life — &quot;University Village&quot; — including Housing, Athletics, Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Promotion of Key Programs, Faculty, Accomplishments, Strengths, Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Personalized Learning Environment — Preserving and Strengthening including Student-Faculty Interaction, Inspiring Students/Promoting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Community Partnerships — Local Connections/Local Stewardship, Community/Business/Education Partnerships — Broad but Local Sens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Multiculturalism — Preserving, Supporting, and Growing Full-Spectrum Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Streamlined Business Processes &amp; Services for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Pragmatic Programs, Results, Professional Focus, and Job Readiness of Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Staff Quality, Commitment, Compensation, Development, and Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Accountability including Implementation, Leadership, Communications, Actualization, and Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Affordability &amp; Broad Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mission, Vision, Values — Realization of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Alumni Connections — Strengthening/Using</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Learning Technology/Online Programs — Expanding and Improving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Student Characteristics/Profile — Pride &amp; Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Accountability including Implementation, Leadership, Communications, Actualization, and Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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APPENDIX "B"
Town Hall Meetings
Comment Streams/Community Mandates Cluster Results

An Efficient, Well-Run University with a Culture of Accountability. We must create, sustain, and reward a culture of excellence, efficiency, accountability, and continuous quality improvement — "a university that works" — as a requirement for survival as well as the foundation for growth and future success. **Total: 344**

- Enrollment & Student Services including Advising (66)
- Financial Stability & Health (41)
- Physical Plant including Quality of and Pride in Appearance, Maintenance, and Safety (137)
- Accountability including Implementation, Leadership, Communications, Actualization, and Strategic Planning (49)

Strong Growth and Full Enrollment with Personalized Learning and Expanded Access. We must aggressively grow and strategically manage our enrollment, benefiting all of our campuses and locations, while increasing access for students from all backgrounds and also strengthening our hallmark personalized learning/teaching environment. **Total: 288**

- Enrollment Growth & Management including all CSUEB Campuses and Locations (143)
- Affordability & Broad Access (71)
- Student Characteristics/Profile — Pride & Problem (34)
- Learning Technologies (40)

Vibrant University Villages. We must plan, develop, and build the infrastructure for a lively, vibrant, and sustainable "University Village" at each of our campuses, where “24/7” facilities and activities promote the quality of life and well-being of students, faculty, and staff, as well as surrounding communities. **Total: 125**

- Campus Life — "University Village" — including housing, athletics, food (125)

An Inclusive Campus Climate that Fosters Multicultural Learning and Competence. We value and insist upon a campus climate characterized by a welcoming, inclusive, and caring atmosphere, responsive to the unique needs of all community members and where multicultural competence, global outlook, and learning experiences infuses our curriculum, policies, and practices. **Total: 354**

- Campus Climate including Internal Identity (81)
- Multiculturalism — Preserving, Supporting, and Growing Full-Spectrum Diversity (88)
- Staff Quality, Commitment, Compensation, Development, and Pride (59)
Tradition of Teaching, Learning, and Academic Quality Emphasized and Reinforced. Our core mission of teaching, learning, and commitment to the success of students of all backgrounds must be honored, reinforced, and reflected through our academic programs, practices, and faculty — and understood as the measure by which our quality is defined and judged. **Total: 344**

- Faculty — Pride in and Health of, including Faculty Support, Development, Compensation, PTR, Grants (96)
- Mission, Vision, Values — Realization of (37)
- Tradition of Teaching, Learning, and Academic Quality Emphasized and Reinforced. Our core mission of teaching, learning, and commitment to the success of students of all backgrounds must be honored, reinforced, and reflected through our academic programs, practices, and faculty — and understood as the measure by which our quality is defined and judged. **Total: 344**
- Academic Programs — Quality, Reputation & Renewal including New/Updated/Expanded (85)
- Personalized Learning Environment — Preserving and Strengthening including Student-Faculty Interaction, Inspiring Students/Promoting Success. (81)
- Pragmatic Programs, Results, Professional Focus, and Job Readiness of Graduates. (42)
- Learning Technology/Online Programs — Expanding and Improving (40)

Our Quest for Distinction Realized. We must identify, develop, cultivate, and invest in the programs, features, and aspects of a CSUEB education we wish to be known for, and promote them consistently and creatively. **Total: 178***

- Choice — Reputation, Image, Visibility, Regional Place/Role Stewardship/1st Choice, Destination, Pride in (148)
- Promotion of Key Programs, Faculty, Accomplishments, Strengths, Quality (30)

University of Choice through Regional Stewardship. Our goal is to be widely recognized as the East Bay’s "own CSU" and the region's high-access public university of choice by building visibility, affinity, and support through greatly increased community and regional service, engagement, and leadership. **Total: 214***

- Choice — Reputation, Image, Visibility, Regional Place/Role Stewardship/1st Choice, Destination, Pride in (148)
- Community Partnerships, Local Connections/Local Stewardship, Community/Business/Education Partnerships — Broad but Local Sense of Community (66)

**APPENDIX "B" NOTES**

Comment streams were double-counted when pertaining to more than one theme.

* While "Campus Climate and University Village" comments total less than other categories, discussion of the concept of a "University Village" and the importance of a greatly enhanced and more vibrant campus climate/life was consistently and passionately voiced, across all participant constituencies.

**Some participants emphasize only need for CSUEB to achieve distinctiveness or mentioned possible specific programs. Others recognized regional stewardship as an overarching strategy for achievement of distinction. Thus there is an overlapping relationship between the two mandates.