

Systemwide Strategic Planning Project Summary Report on Electronic Discussion

Overview

The Steering Committee for the CSU Systemwide Strategic Planning project convened an electronic discussion at 8:00 AM, November 1, 2006, and concluded at 12:00 PM on November 3, 2006. The discussion afforded Steering Committee members an opportunity to comment on suggested language for "domains" and associated questions, which will comprise suggested directions for CSU campus dialogues focused on strategic planning.

Attendance and Participation

The electronic discussion allowed Steering Committee members to post asynchronous comments in a password-protected environment. The discussion was also open to members of the public, who were permitted to comment in a separate forum.

By many accounts, the electronic discussion was a success:

- 25 of the 48 Steering Committee members logged into the site.
- 52 total comments were posted by Steering Committee members.
- 17 Steering Committee members posted at least one comment.
- 10 comments were posted by members of the public.
- There were no reports of technical difficulties.

A more detailed account of participation is included in Appendix A.

Posted Comments

Listed below is an overview of some comments posted in each domain. A complete list of comments is included in Appendix B.

- Domain 1 (10 comments)
 - The CSU salary gap should be addressed as a top priority.
 - The word "capacity" needs to be changed.
 - Special learners' needs should be included.
- Domain 2 (7 comments)
 - More content area planning with K-16 partners is needed.
 - Community college teacher prep must be included.
 - Focus on the accuracy of degree audit information is crucial.
- Domain 3 (7 comments)
 - Support staff have a tremendous impact on CSU perception and reality.
 - The CSU must put greater focus in the public K-12 school systems.
 - There should be greater attention given to CSU alumni.
- Domain 4 (13 comments)
 - We need to make our commitment to students clearer.
 - It's critical to consistently assess and improve faculty and staff.
 - There's lots of information here; perhaps this should be two separate domains.
- Domain 5 (10 comments)
 - Delete the reference to senior staff and full professors.
 - The definitions of "faculty quality" and "staff quality" are unclear.
 - We have not done a good job of "providing incentives for high performance."
- Domain 6 (5 comments)

- To earn respect, the CSU must be a system of academic excellence.
- Students should be key participants in the shared governance process.
- All domain questions need to be carefully read to ensure simplicity and clarity.
- Public (10 comments)
 - I appreciate the ability to participate in this discussion.
 - Why don't you consider including classified staff in your conversation?
 - There should be more attention to excellence.

Benefits of Electronic Discussions

While there are limits to what can be accomplished in electronic forums, web-based discussions can provide great benefits.

- Convenience – Participants can choose to join the discussion when it is most suitable to their schedule.
- Time Efficiency - Participants do not need to travel to a physical location, so no time is wasted on travel.
- Access - Participants can join the discussion from anywhere in the world. All that is required is a computer with an internet connection.
- Reduced Cost – Electronic discussions eliminate the need for airfare, hotel, meals, rental cars, parking, discussion space, and other related costs.
- Better Understanding of Innovative Teaching Tools - The electronic format allows participants to gain first hand knowledge of how faculty and students use technology-based learning tools to improve teaching and learning.

In the future, CSU systemwide advisory committees might consider holding periodic electronic discussions to realize some of the above mentioned benefits. The Academic Technology Services team at the Office of the Chancellor is well positioned to support these efforts.

Appendix A: Steering Committee Member Participation Table

Steering Committee Member	Login Time and Date
1. Henry Reichman	11:33am 11/3/2006
2. Glen Toney	11:26am 11/3/2006
3. Bruno Giberti	11:18am 11/3/2006
4. Eduardo Ochoa	11:06am 11/3/2006
5. Dianne Harrison	11:05am 11/3/2006
6. Jennifer Reimer	10:32am 11/3/2006
7. Valerie Vuicich	10:22am 11/3/2006
8. James Rosser	10:12am 11/3/2006
9. John Welty	9:38am 11/3/2006
10. Michael Ortiz	8:41am 11/3/2006
11. Debra Farar	9:29pm 11/2/2006
12. Glen Toney	8:28pm 11/2/2006
13. James Rosser	5:59pm 11/2/2006
14. Alexander Gonzalez	4:11pm 11/2/2006
15. Jolene Koester	3:52pm 11/2/2006
16. Jennifer Reimer	2:22pm 11/2/2006
17. Boice Bowman	1:48pm 11/2/2006
18. Herbert Fischer	1:08pm 11/2/2006
19. Gary Reichard	12:05pm 11/2/2006
20. Paul Zingg	9:13am 11/2/2006

21. Keith Boyum	9:02am 11/2/2006
22. Bruno Giberti	9:02am 11/2/2006
23. Carmella Franco	9:00am 11/2/2006
24. Marshelle Thobaben	9:21pm 11/1/2006
25. Barry Pasternack	7:14pm 11/1/2006
26. Gary Reichard	5:06pm 11/1/2006
27. Eduardo Ochoa	4:05pm 11/1/2006
28. Boice Bowman	3:10pm 11/1/2006
29. Andrew Laflamme	3:05pm 11/1/2006
30. Gary Reichard	2:56pm 11/1/2006
31. John Gemello	2:46pm 11/1/2006
32. Herb Carter	10:34am 11/1/2006
33. Carol Chandler	10:17am 11/1/2006
34. Gary Reichard	9:01am 11/1/2006
35. Barry Pasternack	8:35am 11/1/2006
36. Keith Boyum	8:01am 11/1/2006

Appendix B: Complete List of Posted Comments

Domain 1 Comments

Keith Boyum	This is a sample comment. I logged in successfully, using the user name and password that we provided. I hope Steering Committee members find this experience productive.
Barry Pasternack	I think in the third question the word "capacity" should be changed to "resources" so it would read "What additional resources does each (campus and system) need in order to do what each should be doing?"
Carmella Franco	<p>I would suggest that the third bullet include a change to the word "capacity", that is, that it read "capacity building" instead. In effect, the essence would encompass what capacity building the institution needs to engage in to be able to do what it needs to do.</p> <p>I also wonder if we should be referring to P-16 rather than P-12, thereby actively including CSU in the collaborative process of preparation.</p>
Paul Zingg	<p>Let me use Domain One as a way to address an issue that is implied in the draft so far, but not explicitly addressed as it must be: that is, the need to strengthen institutional capacities to attract resources for the work of the CSU through private support and partnerships, in particular, those where the leverage capacity of the entire system can be brought to bear.</p> <p>Domain One is silent on the needs of special learners. This is a growing challenge to higher education. Our Adaptive Technology Initiative is one strategy to address this challenge. And, it seems to me, it is a ideal challenge where partnerships with private providers of technology, software, textbooks, etc. can be leveraged because of the magnitude of our educational enterprise.</p>
Herbert Fischer	Issues 1 and 2 would be enhanced through active support and participation by each CSU campus in local and/or regional P-16 efforts involving preschool, K12, community college, CSU and other appropriate 4 year universities as well as community interests and representatives.
Michael Ortiz	<p>I have one suggestion to add to the encouraging improvement in P-12 students' academic preparation but it relates to what I see as an oversight and that is: Financial planning and counseling should begin in middle school.</p> <p>I will ask that the next two questions be added to all domains and will state them at each.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can technology be used to achieve this goal? 2. Can business processes in this area be optimized through the use of enabling technology? <p>We should also look at models like Syracuse University where dual credit programs are offered to engage students in college level course work prior to their graduation from high school.</p>
John Welty	I believe the third bullet should be changed to read as follows: <i>What</i>

	<i>additional change needs to occur in order for the following items to occur?</i>
John Welty	In the introductory section I would like to suggest that a paragraph be included which indicates that the Board has made a commitment to close the salary gap over the next five years. This needs to be the first priority. In addition we should outline key assumptions such as: <i>There will likely be a very modest growth in new resources at the state level; enrollment growth will moderate around the 2009-10 year.</i>
James Rosser	In the third bullet, change "additional capacity" to "baseline resources". I would suggest adding a fourth bullet "What mission specific resources does each (campus and system) need in order to achieve excellence in what each is doing?" In addition, in the #2 add the following to the end of the sentence -- ... removing barriers to transfer and success. Add a #3 to this section, "Assisting in eliminating the P-12 achievement gap."
Bruno Giberti	This is a general observation, but I am posting it here under Domain 1: it is probably not necessary to repeat the three framing questions before every domain. I do think it would be useful to have a specific framing paragraph before each domain, as was suggested at the meeting of the provosts and senate chairs, that could lard the campus conversations with pertinent evidence.

Domain 2 Comments

Keith Boyum	This is a sample comment. I logged in successfully, using the user name and password that we provided. I hope Steering Committee members find this experience productive.
Herbert Fischer	The opportunity for content area (math-language arts-science-social studies) discussion and planning by intersegmental (K-16) partners about institutional expectations and realities would enhance learning experiences at all levels.
Alexander Gonzalez	Under #2, the preparation of teachers should include the community colleges as well as P-12 since the CSU does provide a large number of our graduates who go on to teach in the community colleges. I suggest it read "...in the preparation of teachers at P-12 and the Community Colleges".
Michael Ortiz	A major challenge in implementing degree audit programs is the variability of what is acceptable and what isn't from our community college partners. Once we have completed this task, we should provide access to this tool to the community colleges to assist in a seamless transition and also to prevent students from enrolling in the wrong courses. The use of the EAP data by community colleges for remediation planning would benefit the students seeking admission to the CSU. Continued collaboration with P-12 and the community colleges in seeking extramural funding should be encouraged.

	<p>Questions to add:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can technology be used to achieve this goal? 2. Can business processes be optimized through the use of enabling technology?
John Welty	I would suggest that the third bullet in all of the domains be changed to read as follows: <i>What change needs to occur at the campus and system level in order to achieve the following goals?</i>
James Rosser	<p>Suggested additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ #1 d. would read: "Forging partnerships that address the states workforce needs." ▪ #3 "Redesign of teacher education programs with an emphasis on demonstrated proficiency."
Bruno Giberti	Why are Domains 1 and 2 separated? They both deal with the relationship between CSU, P-12, and CCC.

Domain 4 Comments

Keith Boyum	This is a sample comment. I logged in successfully, using the user name and password that we provided. I hope Steering Committee members find this experience productive.
Barry Pasternack	I suggest adding a fifth point to read: <i>5. Identifying policy changes which might make campuses and the system better stewards of state resources.</i>
Paul Zingg	<p>In many respects, this domain gets to the heart of the matter: what is our role, what is expected of us?</p> <p>This strategic planning effort must, I believe, seek to generate a consensus in this state among stakeholders and constituencies (especially in State government) for the public policy elements of higher education.</p> <p>It is -- or should be -- public policy to promote a strong economy, to provide for a healthy population, to foster a clean environment. That is, to serve the greater public good.</p> <p>Education is the foundation for a knowledge-based economy and a sound social fabric. But we in the CSU cannot simply assert that, or assume that resources (public or private) will flow to us because we are either intrinsically deserving or claiming to serve the public good.</p> <p>We need to make our case that public higher education is as fundamental to the needs of our State as railroads were in the 19th century, as federal highways were in the 20th century, as the Internet is in the 21st. And our case is predicated on how we promote a strong economy, provide for a healthy population, foster a clean environment....</p> <p>Thus, strategic planning is about strategic alignment with the needs of the State and our demonstrated ability, resolve, and</p>

	<p>focus to meet them.</p> <p>This is the stuff of public consensus: clear purposes, clear performances to measure/assess, clear expectations of our stakeholders/constituencies, clear responsibilities of those stakeholders/constituencies (including the legislature and the industries we serve) to support our work.</p> <p>I am not certain that the goals of this strategic planning effort - - and have those goals, which are different from principles, yet to be clearly defined?? -- will be served through generating lots of information that is also available in many other forms: accreditation reports, accountability reports, WASC reports. What is added by more reports?</p> <p>I worry that the project is so big, and unfocused, that it may fall apart for its sheer weight and not be meaningful.</p> <p>Thus, the question about public policy and the suggestion that effecting public policy, developing consensus about the roles and responsibilities for the CSU (for public higher education in California) may be most what we should be seeking to achieve.</p>
Herbert Fischer	<p>The internal stakeholders who represent support staff have a tremendous impact on the overall perception and reality of the University, their effectiveness and that of the programs that they are required to carry out often set the tone for the students and all other constituents. It would be worth the University's time to review their role and that of the institution to determine how the University can become more user friendly. Outreach efforts by the University would be enhanced with more involvement by faculty staff members participating in community and/or school district programs. The public K-12 school systems are the life blood of the CSU and there must be greater participation by the University at this level, it is not the sole responsibility of the Schools of Education to maintain this connection and/or opportunity. This statement does not diminish the fine partnerships that are already in place, we just need more of them.</p>
Michael Ortiz	<p>The numerous public - private partnerships that have been developed by the individual campuses and the system office is clearly indicative of strong stakeholder relationships. The Agricultural Research Initiative at the system level, the crime labs on the Fresno and L.A. campuses along with the work happening on our own campus at Innovation Village are perfect examples.</p> <p>One stakeholder group that we all must focus on is alumni. They have a vested interest in the reputation of their alma mater. Utilizing them in the mentoring of current students is one example of successful programming. Lifetime email addresses is another way to maintain communication.</p> <p>Questions to be added:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can technology be used to achieve this goal? 2. Can business processes be optimized through the use of enabling technology?
Dianne Harrison	I would suggest changing 4 (a) to read: Identifying strategies that will sustain connections with key stake holders.
Bruno Giberti	<p>Make it clear that Domain 3 refers to external stakeholders.</p> <p>Define "stakeholders." This is the kind of language whose meaning may be clearer in one part of CSU (the Chancellor's Office) than another (the campuses).</p> <p>Maybe it should be part of the strategic planning process to define the nature of the commitments CSU needs to fulfill. The domain as currently formulated makes it seem as if these are obvious to everyone involve</p>

Domain 4 Comments

Keith Boyum	This is a sample comment. I logged in successfully, using the user name and password that we provided. I hope Steering Committee members find this experience productive.
Barry Pasternack	I suggest adding a ninth point, which would read: <i>9. Modifying campus and system policies, which may work counter to student success.</i>
Herbert Carter	<p>I think the suggestions offered by Barry regarding a ninth point is good but I would add to it "access" to go along with his thought about student success.</p> <p>I understand point number 8 but I believe that the language could be made clearer. I would suggest language which makes clear our commitment to students falling in these categories beginning with their acceptance by the university.</p>
Andrew Laflamme	<p>Point 2.</p> <p>I believe we were correctly cautious about using the word irrespective. It seems to devalue the notion of tradition class attendance instead of valuing non-traditional means of education, as I believe was intended. I have been unable to figure the exact improved wording. Perhaps the point would more clearly communicate the ideas of the committee if it included language highlighting the inclusion of participation beyond traditional class attendance.</p>
Carmella Franco	<p>The wording for the 8th bullet is awkward. I would suggest that it read "Ensuring 'start to finish' success for students..."</p> <p>I would modify Barry's 9th bullet suggestion to read:</p> <p>"Identify barriers to student success, and as appropriate, modify campus and system policies to ensure the necessary support for that success to occur."</p>
Paul Zingg	We need to use language that will make sense to folks beyond our campuses. "Achieving and effectively demonstrating learning goal attainment consistent with mission and vision,

	<p>and with stakeholder's interests" is, I think, the kind of jargon-filled sentence that we need to avoid, if we want this report to be read and understood -- and embraced -- by our stakeholders.</p> <p>Moreover, a sentence like this begs the question "what are our stakeholder's interests?" And this reminds us that our report/plan must be in touch with them.</p>
Herbert Fischer	I support Barry's point and agree with Carmella's revision.
Alexander Gonzalez	Should the statement that is part of #1 include something about learning in and out of the classroom? It would seem consistent with the other statements of this domain.
Michael Ortiz	<p>At some level, all CSU's are engaged in this process. We are attempting to follow CSUN's learning centered approach, which values and recognizes that learning occurs everywhere in a learning environment. The key is assessing and improving what we (faculty and staff) do on a consistent, ongoing basis.</p> <p>Questions to be added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can technology be used to achieve this goal? 2. Can business processes be optimized through the use of enabling technology?
James Rosser	I would suggest adding a #9 that would read: "Supporting undergraduate student participation in the research, scholarly and creative activities of faculty."
Henry Reichman	I second Andrew's comment on the word "irrespective." I suggest changing to either "in supplement to" or, perhaps, simply "beyond," which has a useful ambiguity to it.
Dianne Harrison	<p>I agree with Paul's comments re: #1. Alternative wording might include: Demonstrating the achievement of outcomes-based competencies among students and communicating these outcomes in ways that are clear and accessible to students, parents, and the public.</p> <p>Suggested rewording of #2: Awarding of credit to degrees using rigorous learning experiences both inside and outside the classroom and employing both traditional and nontraditional pedagogy.</p> <p>Additional item: Preparing students with a global perspective, language abilities, cross-cultural competencies, and technological capabilities that will lead to successful lives and lifelong learning skills.</p>
Bruno Giberti	I think this is a pretty hefty domain compared to some of the others. Perhaps it would be useful to separate the earlier questions, which seem to deal with educational quality, from later ones, which seem to deal more specifically with student success in terms of timely graduation. Perhaps this should be two separate domains.

Domain 5 Comments

Keith Boyum	This is a sample comment. I logged in successfully, using the user name and password that we provided. I hope Steering Committee members find this experience productive.
Barry Pasternack	I suggest adding a 3d. which would read: <i>3d. Identifying and addressing potential roadblocks to success in recruiting and retaining high-quality and diverse faculty and staff for the future.</i>
Herbert Carter	I suggest the deletion of the reference to senior staff and full professors. We should be willing to reward all levels of employees for high (outstanding) performance.
Jennifer Reimer	I find it slightly awkward that points 1 and 2 begin in parallel and then diverge after the word "student." The meat of each of these points deals with student success (or achievement, satisfaction and persistence, as worded in point 2). I think if we use different words to ask about the "student _____" we may produce comments of differing natures. Was this the intention? Jennifer the Student
Herbert Fischer	Suggestion: Add #6 "Expand University outreach to service area constituents by increasing faculty/staff participation in community based initiatives within faculty/staff areas of expertise."
Alexander Gonzalez	The terms "faculty quality" and "staff quality" are used but I'm not sure what that means. Does there need to be some definition?
Michael Ortiz	Questions to be added: 1. How can technology be used to achieve this goal? 2. Can business processes be optimized through the use of enabling technology?
James Rosser	Add a #6: <i>"Exploring additional means of providing job security and long-term program quality."</i>
Henry Reichman	I have a problem with "providing incentives for high performance" when we now don't even have resources adequate to provide incentives for hiring and retention, regardless of performance. We need to have a clear statement that part of this domain is about providing resources adequate for the recruitment and retention of faculty/staff and not only incentives for their performance. Moreover, the "incentives" (and I'd be happy to simply drop the term) need to be clarified as more than simply in the area of compensation or even workload. We need to discuss what Maoists used to call "moral incentives" for faculty and staff -- i.e., what do faculty/staff get in the form of fulfillment that will encourage them to do the kinds of things we believe they will need to do in the future. Frankly, left as is this line will be taken by too many people as just another boilerplate endorsement of unpopular "merit pay" schemes.

Bruno Giberti	<p>I would question again whether it's useful to consider faculty and staff excellence in the same domain. These are obviously intersecting issues, but the questions make it clear that they also diverge in significant ways.</p> <p>I can't help but ask: what about administration excellence? Isn't that a concern of the strategic planning effort?</p>
---------------	---

Domain 6 Comments

Keith Boyum	This is a sample comment. I logged in successfully, using the user name and password that we provided. I hope Steering Committee members find this experience productive.
Michael Ortiz	<p>A system of access must also be a system of academic excellence to earn the respect of the professional world and higher education.</p> <p>Questions to be added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can technology be used to achieve this goal? 2. Can business processes be optimized through the use of enabling technology?
James Rosser	<p>Suggested changes to #1 b. <i>"Affirming, and assuring the vitality of the core values of, shared governance in a collective bargaining environment."</i></p> <p>Add #4 d. <i>"Addressing the issue of affordability within the context of access, excellence, individual campus mission and state and individual/family responsibility."</i></p>
Jennifer Reimer	I suggest adding student-centered language to Dr. Rosser's revision to #1 b. Perhaps it might read "Affirming, and assuring the vitality of the core values of, shared governance in an environment of student-centered participation and collective bargaining." I prefer to think of students to be key participants in the shared governance process.
Bruno Giberti	A final general comment: to insure the best results, all the domains and questions need to be carefully read to ensure that the language is as much as possible simple, clear, and unbureaucratic.

Public Comments

Bill Forrester	I appreciate the ability to participate in this discussion, follow the strategic planning process, and contribute my feedback without having to leave my home. Thank you for making this session available electronic.
Hylah Jacques	These issues are very important to support staff, which could provide important perspectives on the matter if only included. Why don't you consider including classified staff in your sustained conversation as well?
Lindsey	I appreciate the fact that the steering committee is getting feedback from those who are willing to offer it. Not only that,

	<p>but they are also providing the opportunity to do so in an easy to access manner. That being said I do have some feedback to offer in reference to domain 4.</p> <p>As a student at one of the CSU campuses (Cal Poly, SLO) I would like to see a greater investment in student success. I know that both the CSU system and the individual universities attempt to offer the best resources to their students, but our classes are becoming extremely impacted and our facilities overcrowded. It is difficult and sometimes near impossible to get classes. Not only does this delay graduation for many students, but ultimately it places more stress on the CSU system. The system must sustain individual students for a longer period of time. Cal Poly falls victim to this at an almost extreme level. Most engineers jokingly say that they are on the 5 year plan, but the joke is quickly becoming a reality. I think that the system needs to encourage the 4 years (which it does) as well as provide the students with the tools that they need to get this. Including, but perhaps not limited to, easy access to required classes, better schedule planning resources, a variety of classes which meet the same requirements, easy access to faculty, and ample study resources. For example, here at Cal Poly, we have a planner for each quarter before we register, but most CSU campuses do not have their own equivalent. We also follow flow charts for each major (they show a projected typical schedule), but that does not show students when classes will be offered on campus. Perhaps it may be possible to offer students an easy-to-access planner, which would span their college career and is personalized?</p> <p>We are all aware that the student populous on every campus is growing (at some campuses faster than others). Could it be worthwhile to investigate why it grows so much faster at particular campuses? What are the campuses that are so impacted offering students that other CSUs fail to provide? How can the CSU system offer a level of education equal to that of the UCs or even some private colleges without decreasing the availability to students by raising prices? I think that all of those questions are important to ask. We are approaching an era where a college degree is more of a requirement than an option and it is important for the CSU system to implement strong strategic planning for its future.</p>
Cassie	<p>I believe student success starts with enrolling into and getting to class. Both of these are an issue, first with registration. Rarely in my six years at Cal Poly have I been able to enroll in the classes I needed without using a priority, and second with the current impossible parking situation. One way into and out of the major parking lots creates huge amounts of time lost to sitting in traffic that we could use studying. Some students who live out of San Luis Obispo need to drive to class.</p>
Jesse Adamson	<p>Things I would like:</p> <p>More Parking and maybe a light at the intersection to the</p>

	<p>parking lot. Sometimes I have to wait in line for 10 min to get to the parking lot and then I am late to class.</p> <p>Better food system. Maybe the food science department could do some revamping of the campus-dining situation because the meal plan is expensive and I usually got a strange pain in my chest after eating at places like the Light House when I lived in the dorm.</p> <p>The campus bookstore is the most expensive place to purchase a textbook. I think they might be trying to rip us off.</p> <p>CalPoly should own everything on its property. I hear they don't own the housing or the food or the bookstore. Is this true? That would explain why the books, meal plan and housing are so expensive.</p> <p>Make CalPoly Wet. The two reasons I don't want to live on campus are no alcohol and no garage.</p> <p>More access to labs and equipment outside of class for personal projects. CalPoly should promote club and personal projects more. Senior projects and other school projects should not belong to Calpoly, but to the students that created them. I think students would follow through with more ideas that are actually valuable if this were the case.</p> <p>Calpoly should invest a little in renewable energy. It's a good selling point and it just might be the way of the future. Davis is doing it.</p> <p>It is a little hard to get into the classes you need, but I think in general the classes are good, the labs are good, the equipment is above average and the buildings (although some look like they are falling apart on the outside) are pretty nice inside.</p>
<p>Darlene Yee-Melichar, SF State</p>	<p>Under Domain 1 (Assuring Access), item 1.a.ii, it may be helpful to note that many grandparents are raising grandchildren today so it might read "Seeking the help of networks of campus supporters- parents, grandparents, alumni, community leaders, internship providers- in doing this."</p>
<p>Darlene Yee-Melichar, SF State</p>	<p>Under Domain 3 (Fulfilling Commitments to Multiple Stakeholders), item 1, it may be helpful to note that international businesses, exchange programs, and students may enhance the individual campuses and the CSU system as a whole. I suggest adding the word international to read "Reaching out to, partnering with, and serving the right set of local, regional, national, and international groups/constituencies."</p>
<p>Linda Dalton, Cal Poly SLO</p>	<p>I appreciate the invitation to participate in this systemwide effort. For those of us not on the Steering Committee, I am wondering if we might be provided with a little more context. For example, I think the six domains are important, but wonder</p>

why some other topics don't seem to appear.

Most importantly, if the theme is "Access to Excellence," I would hope to see more attention to excellence. The domains include student success and faculty excellence, but where is the curriculum and co-curriculum in the discussion? Further, with all the recent attention by WASC and others to student learning outcomes, I wonder at the absence of this topic - is it because the Steering Committee feels that student learning outcomes are adequately addressed elsewhere?

With that said, I offer some comments on the domains.

Domain 1 is extremely important given demographic trends in California. I would hope that the questions would probe into how to reach prospective students from different backgrounds, and stress in item 1.a. that we need to know how outreach and encouragement programs involve parents and other family members who influence young people's aspirations and expectations about college.

Domain 2. I wonder about whether we might explore how partnerships might address competing incentives between the CCC and CSU. For example, sometimes an AA degree is not the best preparation for transfer into a professional program, yet the CCC rewards AA completion as a measure.

Domain 3. I concur with the importance of this domain, and wonder if the questions might ask campuses to actually identify their key stakeholders by general categories and evaluate their strengths and potentials by type.

Domain 4 might be the place to explicitly ask about student learning outcomes. The present questions focus on important process issues, but we clearly want students to engage in meaningful learning experiences as well. We might want to address the social and environmental factors that affect student interest and success such as campus climate, living conditions, social opportunities, etc.

Domain 5. Is this the area where the curriculum and other measures of program quality should be addressed? Or is this really an additional domain, because the questions in Domain 5 presently refer to personnel issues which are important in their own right?

Domain 6 is critical to articulating the CSU's future - what image do we want to convey? How does it build on or extend the current identity, and how does it embrace the diversity among the campuses.

Thank you again for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion.

<p>Mary Anne Sobieraj, Sonoma State</p>	<p>Having just heard this morning about the request for public comment, I must admit that I have not carefully read the whole document. However, a quick read did bring me to a halt at item #3, Domain 4.</p> <p>Here, the committee suggests that to ensure success in student learning, that the CSU make value-added a part of our core values and "brand".</p> <p>What is the CSU "brand"? When I teach mathematics, what does that mean? What is the CSU brand of teaching mathematics?</p> <p>And value-added? In economics, value-added refers to a way of assuring that double-counting does not occur. I can not even begin to wrap my head around what that is suppose to mean to ensure success in student learning.</p> <p>I think of core values in terms concepts like respect for diversity, understanding global issues, the development of intellectual curiosity, learning to work collaboratively, and so on.</p>
<p>Visitor</p>	<p>Thanks for the opportunity for public commentary on these important matters. I would like to comment about Domain 4.</p> <p>I share concerns about the phrase "value added" in the context used here. I appreciate the NSSE and I think a better way to express the value and EXPERIENCE of a CSU education would involve words such as engagement and experience. We all understand that there is pressure on university to use "non traditional" methods of instruction in order to be competitive in the educational "marketplace."</p> <p>But we cannot compete with electronic degree programs by using the same language of "value added"; professors such as myself will rightly see a correlation between the pressure to make education more efficient (discussed in Domain 1) and the ease with which certain kinds of objective instructional methods may be easily assed to show "value added." We need to celebrate and articulate the complicated learning that takes place IN the classroom. It is that which makes us distinctive. We should not try to compete with the "value added" mentality driving some kinds of educational initiatives.</p> <p>I think the overall tone of "ensuring" student learning is also questionable. While "celebrating" student learning might be over the top, perhaps a term like "recognizing and describing" student learning might be better than "ensuring."</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>