

# Faculty Visioning Task Force Report: 2015-2020

## Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION .....	3
2. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS .....	6
SCUs and the Core Mission of a CSU University .....	6
The Anchor Institution as a possible model .....	8
Full Participation: Diversity and Social Justice .....	11
Community Engagement and Scholarship .....	12
3. TOWARDS STUDENT CENTEREDNESS .....	13
4. THE ROLE OF FACULTY RESEARCH .....	17
5. CURRICULUM: FLEXIBLE STRUCTURES .....	20
6. LOS ANGELES BASIN WORKFORCE NEEDS .....	23
7. CULTURE SHIFT .....	25
8. TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS .....	28
<b>1. CAL STATE L.A. as an Anchor Institution</b> .....	28
<b>2. Civic Engagement</b> .....	31
<b>3. Student-Centeredness</b> .....	32
<b>4. Research and Curriculum</b> .....	36
<b>5. LA Workforce needs   New Programs</b> .....	38
<b>6. Culture shift</b> .....	43
9. REFERENCES .....	47
Appendices .....	58

## Foreword: Six Starting Points

The writers of this report would like to emphasize a few points about its origins, intentions, and recommendations:

First, we were guided by the President's specific charge to the larger Faculty Visioning Task Force, as detailed on page three in the Introduction. That charge led us to focus on "innovative academic programs;" "future needs of the greater Los Angeles region;" "innovative approaches to deliver such programs;" "needs analysis" on "work force and community needs assessment in LA;" "community engagement/service learning;" and "underrepresented students...in urban education."

We believe the report responds directly to the charge given and focuses, appropriately, on programs and university needs related to that charge.

Second, in suggesting new programs, emphases and directions, we are not implying anything about the value of current programs.

Third, the analysis, recommendations, and suggestions for new programs are based on a variety of sources including: discussions of the full task force, presentations to the task force, reports on work force and academic programs in the LA area, responses from two surveys of faculty, a student survey and several student focus groups, and three Town Hall forums during which faculty offered their input on the draft.

Nevertheless, there should be no assumption that the report reflects majority views of faculty, students or administrators.

Fourth, the Writing Committee ultimately concluded that we did not have the expertise to "recommend" new programs. Rather, we have suggested a number of programs or degrees that we believe the university should consider. Again, these suggestions should not be construed to imply anything about current university programs.

Fifth, the authors believe that if the university is going to succeed in the creation of innovative programs and the means of delivering them as advocated in this report, the university community will need to commit to fostering a new university culture. That culture must foster and sustain, among other things: higher levels of collaboration among faculty and between faculty and administration, support and incentives for inter and trans-disciplinary activities, and a spirit of innovation in programs, processes, and relationships with the Los Angeles community in which we work and live.

Lastly, we hope the report will be the start of further discussions around the issues raised. We look forward to those discussions and to participation in other task forces, working groups, committees –formal and informal, broad or narrow in scope-- that may be created to further the dialogue.

*Michael Willard, Walter Zelman, Catherine Haras, Veena Prabhu, and Borislava Gutarts*  
FVTF Writing Subgroup

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In October 2013, President William Covino charged a newly formed Faculty Visioning Task Force (FVTF) to develop a recommendation on:

1) innovative academic programs (degrees and options), and with suggesting modifications for existing programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels that will better align with the existing and future needs of the greater Los Angeles region; 2) innovative approaches to deliver such programs; as well as resource needs and organizational structures associated with launching and sustaining such programs. 3) As part of their charge, task force members will conduct needs analysis and research on issues including but not limited to: a) workforce and community needs assessment in LA; b) student learning including community engagement/service learning; and, c) issues for underrepresented students (especially Latino/a undergraduates) in urban education.

The FVTF charge shares significant elements of the University Strategic Plan, which the President is committed to completing (<http://web.calstatela.edu/univ/ppa/publicat/stratplan/>). The strategic plan connected the campus urban mission with Los Angeles, one of the world's most diverse and dynamic cities. The strategic plan's vision statement acknowledged the tremendous draw of Los Angeles as, simultaneously, an opportunity, a problem, and a solution.

The findings of the Task Force confirm the strategic plan's urban-serving emphasis and recognize the good work that is already being done on campus. CAL STATE L.A. is currently ranked 4th *in the nation* for social mobility (and 7th in the nation in Masters programs) by *Washington Monthly's College Guide*. This is a tremendous distinction for the university and unique within the CSU system. Given our location in East Los Angeles and the San Gabriel Valley, CAL STATE L.A. can continue to distinguish itself by offering academic programs and degrees that are rooted in a liberal education and also address local needs. These programs would follow from a renewed campus commitment to our institutional identity as a minority-serving university, an identity that we have not fully explored.

The strategic plan's second initiative, community engagement, called for an urban community focus as a way to draw upon the region's vast resources. A renewed identity would more directly involve students, faculty, administration and staff to respond to pressing challenges in our neighborhoods. Reimagining our urban mission does much public good: it allows the University to collaborate and strengthen ties locally, to increase the social mobility of our students, and to provide multiple benefits for our students, the university and the very same communities from which our students come.

The recommendations of this report hopefully contribute to a more substantive realization of the original strategic plan. What remains is to develop a shared campus identity that resonates with all of us: students, faculty, staff and administrators.

The Task Force is aware that we are in the midst of substantive change on campus—new leadership including the appointment of a new Provost, semester conversion, and a new GE, to name just a few. We hope the document is the beginning of a longer and ongoing conversation of the type and kind of institution that we aspire to be.

### **A note on our process**

The Faculty Visioning Task Force, a group of 23 faculty and the Interim Provost, met November 2013 through June, 2014, to carry out information and resource gathering. The Task Force invited representatives from regional organizations (such as the LA County Economic Development Corporation), reviewed numerous data, trend analyses, and industry workforce reports and, looked at innovative programs at comparable universities. The task force also surveyed CAL STATE L.A. faculty and students via two electronic surveys (See Appendices 5 and 6), three town halls and took online comments. A writing group composed of six faculty and an administrator summarized the data and conducted additional literature reviews in order to address sections on students, high-impact practices and curricular reform. This group wrote a preliminary draft report for response from the task force as a whole, plus faculty, deans and other administrators to ensure we had addressed concerns from all stakeholders. We considered all comments and suggestions. The document in its current iteration was again revised in December 2014 based on feedback.

The FVTF examined many documents pertinent to the President's charge ([See References](#)). Based on these we identified key areas of growth and demand for future economic and job growth (See section on workforce needs). Our tentative program recommendations to address workforce needs do not necessarily foster innovation in and of themselves. That work is a process that requires an investment of time and talent from multiple stakeholders. For example, at the institutional level of community engagement (i.e., as the University relates to its surrounding communities as a whole rather than the work of individual programs or initiatives), a participatory process of community-based needs analysis would be necessary to more clearly define needs and assets in order to develop sustainable programs and projects on an institutional scale.

It is our hope that following this report the University would conduct an internal survey of faculty research, curricula, programs, initiatives, and student support programs and initiatives related to community engagement in order to be better prepared to coordinate, support, and adapt existing

interest and expertise to fit with community needs in a way that ensures long term growth beyond the entrepreneurial (and thus, potentially, unsustainable) efforts of individual faculty, departments, or programs. The University would then need to engage with the community to ascertain levels of need and commitment. The task force believes that resources and support for a community needs assessment and an internal University scan of existing programs is warranted if the faculty and administration can decide on a robust role for the university in its surrounding area (See [Appendix 1](#) for an overview of university roles in community engagement/development).

## **The Higher Education landscape**

We are mindful that this visioning document is set against the current backdrop of higher education, which has come under increased scrutiny by the public. Universities and colleges now argue for their relevance in ways unimaginable a generation ago. Money has followed this argument: The CSU system has seen state funding decrease by almost 50% in the past 35 years. This represents a significant disinvestment in education. Such disinvestment is driven by a public narrative that those in higher education do not control. Higher education faces a situation similar to other knowledge-based industries that have lost control over some production of content, for example, publishing and print media. Encroaching technology now allows for universally available and expertly curated content, which may or may not continue to pose a threat to universities, historically a source of knowledge production.

Defunding, the globalization of education (including online learning), the emergence of for-profit universities, and new demands for accountability make universities defensive and vulnerable. But the most serious threat facing CAL STATE L.A. is probably competition from other campuses like ours. American universities in the vast “middle tier”, that is, four-year, nonprofit public universities, are most vulnerable to market forces (DeMillo, 2013). Whether we buy this “market” narrative or not, we are one of *seven* local CSUs in the basin, and are not the first school of choice for many students, including those living within our service area. Latinos, who make up a majority of our vibrant student body –and 50% of the people living in Los Angeles—represent a critical population for our campus to attract and graduate.

Many universities have responded with new models to reposition their core strengths. This is the focus of this Visioning Task Force report. Universities with foresight are assessing their place in the landscape of higher education, and articulating their value in unique and local versions against a larger, national narrative about the value of liberal education and the public purpose of higher education. Here we attempt to reimagine some models that may resonate with students and

community.

In order to address the President's charge the report is divided into seven sections. In section 2 (below) we address institutional frameworks, including our current status as a state comprehensive university, as this affects the overall vision of the University. In section 3 we discuss what a student-centered mission resembles, addressing 3 b) and c) of the charge. Sections 4 and 5 of this report look at the role of faculty research and curriculum as these may affect innovative approaches to delivering new programs (2 in the President's charge). Section 6 addresses Los Angeles workforce needs, 3 a) of the charge. Part 7 looks at culture shift, which we feel is necessary in order to fulfill the charge. Finally, section 8 includes our final recommendations (1 in the charge).

## **2. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS**

### SCUs and the Core Mission of a CSU University

California's public higher education system outlines a distinct mission for each of its three systems. As part of the California State University system, CAL STATE L.A. is a state comprehensive university (SCU). In general, the heart of the SCU mission for colleges and universities across the country consists of (arguably) "the provision of higher education, often with a vocational bent, to a broad range of students who might not otherwise obtain one, the conduct of modest amounts of research, often applied in nature, and the provision of services to its regions and communities" (Henderson, 2009, p. 11). Key features of the public mission of state-funded universities are "open access, [and] educating civil servants, teachers, and practitioners of the 'helping professions'" (Calhoun, 2011). Historically, CSUs were so-called normal schools which trained school teachers. The motto of the CSU is "Working for California."

Within the current public debate that questions the purpose of higher education, SCU status can be turned into an advantage, especially in the CSU system. While the Cal State system shares an emphasis on workforce preparation with SCUs more broadly, it also retains an emphasis on Liberal Education. This is true in the CSU's 42-unit General Education requirements for all degree programs. And it is true in the breadth of degree programs across the Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences. The Liberal Arts and Sciences are a cornerstone of the system.

The Teacher-Scholar model used by the CSU is also adaptable and more flexible than we give it credit for. Because faculty are not hamstrung by onerous publishing requirements typical at research universities, we are free to explore various models of research and teaching that can be good for scholarship, good for students and good for the institution. These include basic and applied research models. Campuses that allow themselves to explore and revisit curriculum, such as the recent General Education revision, typically develop organic ways of addressing issues that reflect local concerns and showcase campus expertise.

Comprehensive universities and colleges across the country have further refined the Teacher-Scholar model to acknowledge the value of different kinds of knowledge production. This movement to clarify and balance knowledge production centers on the pioneering work of Ernest Boyer, whose *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990) identified the scholarship of “Discovery” (basic research); “Application/Engagement” (applied knowledge for specific impact); “Integration” (inter- and transdisciplinary research); and “Teaching and Learning” (pedagogical research). Across higher education it is remarkable how consistently and frequently revisions to RTP policies are based on Boyer’s original framework. The list below includes CSUs, SCUs, and Urban and Metropolitan universities (i.e., universities that are comparable in institutional role and/or mission to CAL STATE L.A.) who have recognized as valid all four forms of scholarship<sup>1</sup>:

#### CSUs

- California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo (Masters Colleges and Universities)

#### State Comprehensive Universities

- Texas State University (San Marcos; Masters Colleges and Universities)
- Towson State University (Baltimore metropolitan area; Masters Colleges and Universities)
- Missouri State University: (Springfield; Masters Colleges and Universities)
- University of Michigan-Dearborn (Detroit metropolitan area; Masters Colleges and Universities)

#### Urban and Metropolitan Universities

- Portland State University (Research University)

---

<sup>1</sup> City and Carnegie Classification listed in parentheses.

- Virginia Commonwealth University (Richmond; Research University)

Diverse scholarship models are emerging as appropriate--and reinvigorating--for campuses such as ours. For metropolitan SCUs, broader tenure policies further allow for synergies to occur across teaching, research, and service that can position the institution as a leading contributor to the literature on urban learning.<sup>2</sup>

Thriving SCUs have much in common with Anchor Institutions, discussed below. SCUs are seemingly obvious partners to work with local communities for their mutual benefit (Alliance for Regional Stewardship, 2006; Votruba et al., 2002). Because their mission prioritizes teaching *and* research, SCUs are better able to pursue place-based strategies in ways that integrate broad definitions of research, scholarship, and creative activity more productively than teaching institutions such as community colleges. That is, teaching, research, and service can all become means toward the same end (Alliance for Regional Stewardship, 2006, pp. 19-23). We should view our SCU status as a distinction and an opportunity.

### **The Anchor Institution as a possible model**

In recent decades colleges and universities have increasingly turned their research expertise upon themselves, examining the role of institutions of higher education in society and more specifically on how higher Ed engages with communities (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). Growth of this movement over the last 20-plus years can be seen at the national level in the creation of professional associations and large-scale initiatives such as:

- The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (founded in 1989);
- The Coalition of Urban-Serving Universities (founded in 2005);
- Campus Community Partnerships for Health (founded in 1997);
- Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life (founded in 1999);
- The 2000 report of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (founded in 1887) which “renewed community engagement as the critical land grant mission of the 21<sup>st</sup> century”;

---

<sup>2</sup> For further discussion of the ways that universities have expanded RTP criteria in order to increase their relevance and ensure long term sustainability see Cruz, Ellern, Ford, Moss, & White, 2013; Ellison, & Eatman, 2008; O’Meara, 2005, 2011; Seifer, Blanchard, Jordan, Gelmon, & McGinley, 2012.



- Loyola University of Chicago’s participation in The Improving Science Shop Networking initiative, begun in 2003 with €4,000,000 funding from the European Commission “to enable science shops in Europe and beyond to share expertise and know-how with the aim of improving citizen access to scientific knowledge” (European Commission, 2003)
- The Anchor Institutions Task Force (begun at the University of Pennsylvania’s Netter Center for Community Partnerships in 2009);
- The establishment in 2012 of civic science as a “signature approach” of the American Commonwealth Partnership, “a new collaboration between national organizations and colleges and universities known for their commitment to advancing civic learning and democratic engagement” (civic-science.org).<sup>3</sup>

These initiatives foster living labs. Universities across the country have founded centers and institutes that support lively community-university partnerships, community-engaged scholarship, and community-based teaching and learning. Such centers have become relatively common and are often a default component of many university programs and strategic plans. However, innovative universities that have pursued a regional strategy (as only one of a university’s multiple local and global goals) have done so by harnessing *already existing* programs to the characteristics and needs of their regions. These provide tangible evidence of the “public good” that universities contribute to their communities; to educational success through the integration of teaching and action research; and to civic-minded students/graduates who understand that their preparation for 21<sup>st</sup> century jobs combines professional with civic competencies in order to address the complex, unstructured, and interrelated problems of an interdependent global society (See Steinberg, Hatcher, & Bringle, 2011; National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012).

The task force found the Anchor institution model to be a successful university-level strategy for facilitating community engagement through partnership with other institutions, faculty research and community-based curricula. Anchor institutions (AIs) are large, place-bound, and tied to the neighborhoods, towns, and cities in which their constituents, clients, and customers live and work. AIs are characterized by a social justice mission that encompasses the core values of democracy and the achievement of social equity (AITF/ Marga, 2013). AIs can provide resources to address the needs in the surrounding areas (Maurrasse, 2013). The partnerships that AIs form typically

---

<sup>3</sup> For a comprehensive list of national organizations, local urban initiatives, and university centers see “University and Community Partnerships” on [Community-Wealth.org](http://Community-Wealth.org)

focus on economic development (especially “green economy” initiatives), housing (Community-Wealth.org, 2013; Cantor, Englot, & Higgins, 2013), the role of arts, culture and design, university-K-12 partnerships, and health care. In short, AI partnerships focus on most major aspects of urban living.

The role of an anchor institution varies (See [Appendix 1](#)). A university’s role can be defined in three ways: 1) as a facilitator of scholarly engagement, education, science, arts, humanities, and healthy partnerships; 2) as a leader of revitalization efforts in adjacent neighborhoods; or, 3) as a convener of revitalization in targeted neighborhoods (Axelroth & Dubb, 2010).<sup>4</sup>

This visioning report identifies the promise and potential of an AI approach to the development of new programs because it both promotes new structures of collaboration internally and contributes to concrete realization of public goods outside the university. The writing group endorses a collaborative exploration by the university community to determine the exact form an AI strategy would take at CAL STATE L.A.

Exploring robust Anchor Institution and SCU models could revitalize engagement between the campus and its constituents. Adapting these models to CAL STATE L.A. in ways that make sense for faculty, staff, students, administrators, and the surrounding community could signal to potential donors and local stakeholders—to companies, citizens, and political leaders—that the University is current, connected, and prioritizes relevance to local needs.

At the critical program level, the Anchor Institution model could be manifested in a number of ways:

---

<sup>4</sup> Projects can include a combination of presidential and institutional initiatives, faculty contributions through teaching, research, or service, student participation through experiential education (service learning, community based participatory research) or co-curricular programs, and staff participation that supplement the institution’s material, economic and intellectual resources. Each of the following practices has been adopted by one or more AI universities (Community-Wealth.org):

- Service learning,
- Community development at minority serving institutions
- Leveraging assets
- Investing endowments (Ohio State, Trinity College)
- Local purchasing/hiring (LeMoyne-Owen, Penn, USC)
- Mixed-use development (Howard, Washington-Tacoma, Syracuse)
- Business incubation (Northern Kentucky, Virginia Commonwealth)
- Urban community research centers (UI-Chicago, Michigan)
- Affordable housing (Jackson State, U of Texas Pan-American)
- University K-12 partnerships (Coppin State, Penn)
- Comprehensive urban mission (Portland State, U of Wisconsin Milwaukee)

- Individual faculty could develop long term projects with Anchor Institution initiatives in specific neighborhoods or in-depth partnerships with specific institutional partners;
- Engaged departments could coordinate their curricula with Anchor Institution initiatives in specific neighborhoods or with specific institutional partners;
- Faculty from different departments could engage in multidisciplinary projects in conjunction with Anchor Institution initiatives in specific neighborhoods or with specific institutional partners; and,
- Faculty or departments could participate in “targeted” basic or applied research projects (including undergraduate research through dedicated courses) with faculty and students from other nearby colleges and universities to focus on local issues (See the next section, “Targeted Knowledge Production” for more on collaborations between basic and applied research). This approach could be extended to form “strategic research” consortia with other colleges and universities.

### **Full Participation: Diversity and Social Justice**

The University is officially recognized for the students it serves. CAL STATE L.A. students (and the immediate communities around the University) are incredibly diverse. The University is a federally designated Title III institution – a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). It is also a Minority-Serving Institution and an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI). Our ethnic studies programs are historic and some of the first to be created in any institution of higher education.

Diversity is part of the University’s institutional identity. We believe a number of the recommendations and emphases highlighted in this report have the potential to foster and strengthen that identity and the values that underlie it. These include: enhancing the University’s relationship with immediate communities as suggested by Anchor Institution status; encouraging faculty research related to community engagement be it through public/engaged arts and humanities and/or strategic research and civic science; and, creating and implementing innovative tools and teaching and learning programs for a diverse student body. Overall, we believe that the University has an opportunity to explore ways that engagement and diversity enhance the University’s public mission.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, the public arts and humanities organization “Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life” has begun a research collaboration with the Center for Institutional and Social Change of Columbia University Law School, Syracuse University and the University of Southern California “to build higher education institutions that enable people from all communities, backgrounds, and

For recommendations on this section see [page 29](#).

## Community Engagement and Scholarship

Community Engagement as pedagogy and a practice is emphasized in the strategic plan, prominently placed in the recent General Education revision, and central to the work of an Anchor Institution. Formal engagement with Los Angeles and communities in CAL STATE L.A.'s service area complements the urban mission of the campus and positions the campus as a locus of financial, intellectual, and social capital for both the metropolitan region and the diverse communities that surround it. Community engagement has not only become a consistent institutional priority for colleges and universities as they seek to more explicitly define their historic role of serving the public good in response to the complexities of global interdependence in the 21<sup>st</sup> century—it is also an effective response to public perceptions of the relevance and effectiveness of current educational priorities and practices that would impose standards that do not originate from within higher education.

National research studies have provided evidence acknowledging the critical role played by service learning and civic engagement in the higher education experience, reasserting that educational institutions commit to educating students to become whole citizens (Horgan & Scire, 2007). Similarly, the Strategic Plan lists one of CAL STATE L.A.'s values as Public Stewardship.

Many faculty have the uneasy sense that they do not understand what an “engaged faculty” status means for them or whether they are compelled to participate in community engagement. This report offers models and suggestions for further study to create programs that would complement existing curricula and research. Faculty as researchers and scholars would not be expected to change their research agendas if they did not wish to.

Some of the possible initiatives that we discuss are based in partnerships in and with local communities (See Section on Research and Curriculum) featuring transdisciplinary teams of faculty who would work on local issues. These efforts could be combined with curricular forms of engagement such as service learning, action research, and civic science so that interested faculty could *also* produce knowledge as a public good. Therefore, community engagement should ideally

---

identities to participate fully, and in the process, to build collective knowledge and capacity needed to solve difficult public problems, a dual agenda . . . refer[ed] to as “institutional citizenship” (Imagining America citing Susan Sturm, n.d.).

form a curricular base for institutional identity, student success, and interdisciplinary collaboration. However, the FVTF recognizes the value of the diverse scholarship produced by faculty in all departments and disciplines.

**For recommendations on this section see [page 31](#).**

### **3. TOWARDS STUDENT CENTEREDNESS**

Our students bring special skills to the table: they are hard-working, eager to learn, compassionate, respectful, and have significant life experiences. CAL STATE L.A. students reflect the socioeconomic and ethnic diversity of Los Angeles, which in turn reflects the diversity of the globe. This environment provides for our students an opportunity to learn in a university in a city that exemplifies the future in which they will live. This is the privilege of being in Los Angeles. We believe that a CAL STATE L.A. education should earn our students insights, understanding, and abilities that can position them for global leadership roles.

Many local high schools have focused only on knowledge acquisition without developing in our students so-called deep learning abilities such as analysis, critical thinking or critical reading. Understanding that most college freshmen enter the university with varying degrees of knowledge acquisition and skill development, we (unlike many universities who use this variability to screen and remove prospective students), seek to provide to our students educational experiences that strengthen knowledge and skills by placing this process in a context that encourages greater student engagement.

#### **College readiness**

The large literature on minority undergraduates indicate that socio-economic status correlates positively with student preparation and students' ability to navigate within and relate to the university as community. However, it is likely that our approach to students' varying levels of preparedness and engagement continue to account for only slowly improving retention and graduation rates on the campus. The FVTF affirms an approach to teaching and learning that is based on high expectations of students; that upholds students as valid members of the university community (Pérez & Ceja, 2010; Rendón, 1994; Rendón, 2002; Hagedorn, Cypers, & Lester, 2008; Ornelas & Solorzano, 2004); and that incorporates students' community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005; 2006) in conjunction with available research on cognitive development and learning,

that is, practices and proven social-psychological interventions that help our students to reach their potential.

A significant percentage of our students are underprepared. Studies demonstrate that students who complete even one developmental education class (as opposed to studies that only focus on whether students enroll in a developmental education class) persist and graduate at higher rates than students who do not complete or do not take developmental education classes (Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey, 2006). Students who participate in learning communities (which develop academic literacy) also persist and graduate at a higher rate (Barnes & Piland, 2013). There is local evidence from Cal State Northridge that minority participation in high-impact practices contributes to persistence and graduation (Huber, 2010). To persist, students who begin college by doing pre-college (developmental) work must believe that they belong (exhibit high self-efficacy) and that they are capable of doing college work (Yeager & Walton, 2011).

CAL STATE L.A. has a history of successful programs that help students to develop their college readiness. We are doing much right, for example, the EOP and EOP Summer Bridge programs, and the First Year Experience (FYE) program. As an example, FYE employs a number of high-impact practices that provide pathways for incoming freshmen to reach their college readiness: common intellectual experiences, learning communities, peer mentoring, math study groups, and diversity and global learning through cultural events. In particular, FYE emphasizes a cohort model. English classes at both the developmental and college levels are linked to required classes, such as Comm 150 and the Colleges' Introduction to Higher Education-101 course with the University Academic and Advisement Center. Additionally, English sections are cohorted with lower-division electives from the departments of Chicano Studies; Liberal Studies; Music, Dance, and Theater; and Pan-African Studies. These promote community and belonging. Students who participated in cohorts were more likely to pass their classes than peers who did not.

At present these experiences are not offered to the entire freshman body. For example, *IHE 101*, the university's equivalent of a college first-year experience (FYE) course, is variously developed across the colleges and is not linked with other first-year courses such as English, Math or COMM 150. FYE and pre-college training could be coordinated in a more intentional way, including cohorting the entire freshman class. We can and should do more to avail all beginning undergraduates to prepare them for a more fully realized college education.

## **What do students need to learn?**

There is a complex set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that inform a college education. The unique development of critical imagination and a sophisticated sense of the world foster lifelong habits and a love of learning; liberal education also has the power to increase economic opportunity. The American Association of Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U) LEAP (Liberal Education & America's Promise) goals are attentive to workplace needs while arguing for the breadth of a liberal education. A university education is more than knowledge acquisition and skills development. Students should grow a keen understanding of themselves and the context in which they live both locally and globally. The first initiative of the University strategic plan, Student Success, articulated liberal arts development and professional training. The University must also prepare students for jobs that do not yet exist.

The CSU has adopted the AAC&U's LEAP outcomes for its General Education mandate, but less mentioned is the AAC&U's "VALUE Rubric Development Project" in which teams of faculty developed 16 rubrics for LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. Focusing on critical thinking, problem solving, information literacy, teamwork, global knowledge, civic engagement, and intercultural knowledge and competence (to name only some), the rubrics make clear that in order for students to find their education relevant and to develop competencies demanded by industry, parents, and legislatures (which the LEAP outcomes address), the university has to design a responsive, integrated curriculum.

In the documents and literature we examined students' intellectual development is associated with multiple literacies such as those found in the LEAP. These reflect the reality and complexity of 21st century life. They include foundational literacy such as the ability to read and write well, speak well, and to practice basic quantification. They also include technological literacy. The internet has galvanized all sectors of society, including education. Information literacy (the ability to recognize when information is needed and to efficiently locate, accurately evaluate, use, and clearly communicate information in various formats), and visual and media literacy are also expected of citizens. Also, our entering students are Millennials, which is to say, digital natives (Howe, 2000; ECAR, 2013). The social role that technology plays defines this generation and new literacies and abilities should be well developed in the curriculum. Furthermore, professional workforce expectations mean students must learn to work in teams (Levine & Dean, 2012; Tyner, 2009). Raising core skills to professional levels of performance is a key opportunity identified in this report. There is an increasing realization in professional fields that integration of breadth and depth

is necessary within professional education curricula (See for example, Colby, Ehrlich, Sullivan, & Dolle, 2011). Integration of liberal arts breadth and disciplinary depth can be accomplished through discipline-based, but multi-disciplinary learning.

The point here is that *many* abilities are required for our students to flourish in an increasingly demanding workforce and civil society. These are not exclusive-- but are often seen as separate in the curriculum. Students do not see their academic experience as siloed between studies and support services, e.g. the library or academic advising. Thoughtfully integrated skills should enable any CAL STATE L.A. student to work in the coming trans-institutional, global and collaborative work environment.

### **General Education Pathways**

One way to achieve this integration is through the new General Education Pathways. These are yet to be developed, but promising. The GE Pathways will play a critical role on campus, building various literacies in an intentional and programmatic way and should be intentionally designed to integrate the LEAP skill set.

The new General Education policy approved by the Senate in 2014 provides several opportunities to improve student success and develop these skills. This work is aligned with the LEAP outcomes and CSU Executive Order 1065. However, the additional and intentional incorporation of multiple high-impact practices will require development of capacity for these activities (service/civic learning; writing intensive courses and diversity) as well as faculty development to implement them effectively. An important component of these and all GE coursework will be information literacy. Related, and adding imperative, is the expectation of WASC, our accrediting body, to evaluate student proficiency in information literacy at the degree level.

The next step in the GE program is to develop meaningful pathways for our general education program that perform several important roles:

- Provide a uniting theme, societal problem or issue that
  - Spans all disciplines
  - Is aligned with our campus mission and goals, and
  - Provides a level of rigor appropriate to the level of course in the GE program.

Pathways are critical to ensure students will have access to complete their GE program in a timely fashion and also in retaining our identity through a distinctive curriculum.



Finally, many of our students have substantial life experiences and are tied to their communities. Many want to "give back". There is a strategic opportunity here. Experiential education in the form of service learning and work-integrated learning (internships and industry-sponsored projects), help students develop the confidence that they are receiving a practical and formative education. It also leverages our students' inclination to help each other. Undergraduate research is another high-impact practice that develops this leadership and skill in students. Developing institutional support communities that encourage first-generation and minority students to negotiate and problem-solve their new educational environment will be critical. Encouraging our students to stay on campus should be a priority (See Culture section).

### **Undergraduate Program Excellence**

In this section we concentrated broadly on literacy acquisition for all undergraduates as a universal issue for the campus, including pre-college, GE and first-year experiences.

The FVTF report acknowledges the many fine individual undergraduate and graduate programs and curricula already in place at CAL STATE L.A. It is beyond the scope of this report to discuss these. However, the following sections of the report hold the promise of reimagining program curricula across the colleges by involving students more fully in faculty research, and by opening up curricular structures to accommodate practices known to increase graduation rates. These include engagement outside of campus (community engagement and even study abroad), supplemental instruction, peer mentoring and experiential learning. These practices are naturally embedded in the models we will discuss.

**For recommendations on this section see [page 33](#).**

## **4. THE ROLE OF FACULTY RESEARCH**

This vision report in no way diminishes the role that faculty as researchers play on our campus and in the scholarly record. Many of us will continue to conduct and publish on well-established research agendas. CAL STATE L.A. is also unique as a regional university in that it balances the more frequent vocational emphasis of the SCU with an equal emphasis on the Liberal Arts and Sciences. These areas all provide robust research opportunities. CAL STATE L.A. retains features of the research university (which is global and universalistic and values inquiry and rigor), and possesses the distinctive features of the regional university; it offers professional degrees,

espouses a strong service and civic engagement orientation, and emphasizes knowledge production in the context of application with local partners (Pineiro, 2012). Across CAL STATE L.A.'s six colleges, both basic and applied research is emphasized. Research models can also be combined and integrated with teaching where appropriate.

The FVTF was interested to explore models for new programs that increased the university's local relevance while maintaining and drawing upon faculty expertise in ways that provide students with flexible options. Such models exist already in terms of interdisciplinary programs and centers, minors and certificates. Some degree programs offer students added flexibility; students can take advantage of electives, or structures that offer core classes combined with options. It is beyond the scope of the FVTF to delineate all the current structures which provide students with control and flexibility, but we do suggest a model below that preserves the values of liberal education by combining research (basic, applied, and teaching and learning) with more open curricular structures.

Public universities worldwide have struggled to balance their aspirations for global excellence with demands for local relevance. Many universities' interests are evolving in response to external conditions and in recognition of the kind of higher education that is best for students, including allowances for multiple types of scholarship.<sup>6</sup> In the arts, humanities and sciences, models include *Engaged Arts and Humanities* and *Strategic Research*, either of which is worth considering on our campus. Both kinds of scholarship could be part of an Anchor institution strategy that would give faculty from the Liberal Arts and Sciences the chance to partner with faculty from professional schools (and vice versa) to carry out research that has universal value but that also has targeted use, focused on local needs in partnership with local institutions and communities.

### *Engaged Arts and Humanities*

The Arts and Humanities have traditionally valued imagination, creativity and interpretation (and the critical thinking competencies it strengthens). The Arts and Humanities develop a stronger sense of humanity (empathy for example), and diversity (analysis of inequality and skills of social interaction across differences). Recent research reaffirms these basic tenets. For example, a social science study demonstrated that art contributes to the development of empathy. Studies at

---

<sup>6</sup> There is some evidence that a strategic research emphasis creates "broader options for funding--including strategic grants or industry sponsorship" (Pineiro, 2012). Collaboration with and support Advancement and Development would also be necessary.

UC Irvine and the New School for Social Research have demonstrated that reading literary fiction “enhances the ability to detect and understand other people's emotions, a crucial skill in navigating complex social relationships” (Bury, 2013; Shapiro, Morrison, & Boker, 2004). Such work lends new evidence to the values of diversity that the Arts and Humanities have always affirmed. A broader movement in the arts and humanities expressed in the acronym STEAM (Science/Technology/Engineering/Arts/Mathematics) incorporates arts into traditional STEM fields. This incorporation of the liberal arts within science and technology fields will make students better prepared, if not more competitive.

The University of Sheffield's visionary “Arts Enterprise” initiative has made it possible for its Humanities departments to become global leaders in their respective fields.<sup>7</sup> Engaged arts and humanities initiatives all share an emphasis on civic engagement, co-production of knowledge with students, and community partners. Sheffield University's initiative is notable for its scope. Rather than the entrepreneurial work of a few faculty, or the efforts of one enterprising department or curricular program, the Arts Enterprise initiative is an open structure that allows faculty from across the Humanities to participate in defining, developing, and carrying out projects of varying duration. The initiative serves as a permanent hub with opportunities for original research (“Higher Education: The University of Sheffield, n.d.). It is one model that might be considered (Arts Enterprise: Current Projects, n.d.). **See [Appendix 2](#) for a list of exemplars.**

### *Strategic Research and Civic Science*

Strategic research originated in policy study as a means to connect basic research to solving current problems (Irvine & Martin, 1984). During the last three decades the term “strategic research” has come to refer to modes of knowledge production that seek to address complex problems such as environmental sustainability that span industrial application, governmental decision-making, and local problem solving (Rip, 2004; Hessels & Van Lente, 2008). Strategic research can combine basic with applied research to target local issues. Strategic research closely aligns with civic science which endeavors to involve non-experts in the co-production of knowledge relevant to local needs and partnerships.

---

<sup>7</sup> Sheffield's English department in collaboration with artists have created an initiative (and course) called “Storying Sheffield” which allows students and community members to participate in creating their own narrative artifacts that “examine contemporary life and identity with their productions showcased at a variety of public events” (About Storying Sheffield, n.d.).

For recommendations on this section see [page 36](#).

## **5. CURRICULUM: FLEXIBLE STRUCTURES**

A significant coordination of faculty talent and innovative approaches to curriculum will be increasingly required if CAL STATE L.A. is to achieve the mission of engaging with the community and tackling large scale projects wherein true community engagement would surely follow. Faculty collaborations across disciplines are critical to this effort.

### **Collaboration across disciplines, departments, and colleges**

**Transdisciplinary** approaches entail the creation of faculty teams that work outside of their own disciplines and/or departments. A transdisciplinary team approach requires members to share roles and systematically cross discipline boundaries, even going beyond academic conventions particular to the discipline. Transdisciplinary teams are usually created for the purpose of long-term collaboration and are housed outside of the usual departmental structure. **Multidisciplinary** approaches also bring together faculty from different disciplines but generally do so for a specific period of time and a specific project or set of projects. Unlike faculty in transdisciplinary approaches, those involved in multidisciplinary projects remain intellectually independent, ask different questions and disseminate knowledge differently than in a transdisciplinary model (Klein, 2008). Both trans- and multi-disciplinary programs may be housed in or coordinated by several departments. **Interdisciplinary** approaches, in contrast, are usually housed within a specific department or program.

For example, a transdisciplinary research team of faculty and students investigating topics in "environmental sustainability" might be composed of chemists, biologists, transportation engineers, public policy experts, sociologists, anthropologists, humanities scholars, and artists, all conducting research and/or applying knowledge to a specific issue, e.g. transportation and air quality. Each specific issue explored by the team might have a life cycle, perhaps two years, after which the team might publish its research and move on to another issue in the "environmental sustainability," arena. Such collaboration would offer unique opportunities for student participation in research, trans/inter/multidisciplinary collaboration, civic engagement, and publication.

Similarly, transdisciplinary teams could focus on issues of health, labor, immigration, race, sexuality, and environmental sustainability (to name only some of the many pressing concerns of a globally interdependent society) in ways that draw on the interest and expertise of faculty from across the University with regard to issues of diversity and equity. The proposed addition of a Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies degree program is a case in point.

## Cluster hires

Cluster hires are intended to form groups of faculty who work (research, publish, team teach) together on trans-, multi- or interdisciplinary programs in new areas of inquiry. For example in the 1990s the University of Wisconsin conceived and implemented the Cluster Hiring Initiative, “to foster the growth of new areas of knowledge and deal with some of the institutional barriers to interdisciplinarity” (Clark, 2008).<sup>8</sup>One could also imagine a university hiring (as many do), a group or cluster of faculty members from different disciplines and with different skill sets to provide a core research and teaching team for longitudinal projects. Other faculty members, from multiple departments could participate as interested or needed.

At CAL STATE L.A. the University could consider cluster hires of individuals with different skill sets—teaching, basic or applied research, community engagement expertise—to address complex problems in the Los Angeles region. Such problems might include such subjects as environmental sustainability, education, technology, health, and engaged arts and humanities.

Such an effort would require a flexible, curricular structure that provides support for large projects involving multiple disciplines. These structures, discussed below, can provide students with multi-, inter- or trans- disciplinary experiences in real-world contexts. Aligned with an Anchor Institution approach and paired with similarly “targeted” strategic research projects, these experiences could also be tied to faculty research.

---

<sup>8</sup> The seven major goals of the Wisconsin Cluster Hiring Initiative were to:

1. Enable the campus to devote a critical mass of faculty to an area of knowledge not addressed by existing departments;
2. Provide new research tracks and collaborative opportunities;
3. Address complex societal problems;
4. Advance the Wisconsin Idea by serving society’s needs through interdisciplinary research, teaching and service;
5. Encourage and foster cooperation within an already strong faculty and staff;
6. Create new curricular offerings on the graduate and undergraduate levels; and
7. Assist in the fulfillment of other missions of the University, specifically increasing campus diversity

## Open curricular structures

Several universities have developed open curricular structures that take advantage of disciplinary expertise across colleges. These structures are sometimes called *hubs* and *threads*. The hubs are permeable structures (centers and programs) that draw from existing departments. Threads are linked sequences of courses (or linked faculty for research projects), that emanate from the hubs. The chief virtues of such open structures lie in their cross-functional and non-territorial attributes. They are not tied to any single department. They draw on faculty expertise from different colleges and departments. They facilitate integration among group members and achievement of group goals.<sup>9</sup> They generate and facilitate faculty community and collaboration. Hubs predominantly employ a transdisciplinary approach.

For instance, in our environmental sustainability example above, in addition to various faculty experts who might study an issue like water in the LA basin, the research team might include the following: grant writers, advancement and development staff, faculty with expertise in translating basic research into policy options, and others with knowledge of local communities, industry, labor, non-profit and political sectors. Students could be fully involved in both research (basic and applied) and civic engagement elements of the project.

Such a collaborative endeavor would be complex, require resources and entail a substantial commitment to a particular project for a significant amount of time. But the potential for research, teaching, civic engagement learning experiences and positive community impact would be substantial.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> For these projects to work well they must be managed by faculty who are willing to act as “boundary spanners”. While project managers may be more familiar as an important role students would assume in 21st century careers, the role of a boundary spanner is new to group forms of knowledge production. A boundary spanner can link different metrics, forms of inquiry, and data within a project team or network. Put more simply they have the ability to create and make clear links between people, kinds of information, and problems.

<sup>10</sup> The same hubs and threads structure could be carried out in terms of curricular options for students at the program level, for example, the baccalaureate in Computer Science that Georgia Tech recently redesigned for students using a threaded curricular structure. Within its school of Computer Science, Georgia Tech University has created a threaded curriculum that allow students to focus on various contexts for computer science, such as: **Embodiment**: Computing meets the physical world, in such areas as robotics and real-time embedded systems; **Intelligence**: Computing as cognition, its representation and processes; **Computational Modeling**: Computing for representing the world, as in computational sciences; **Platforms**: Computing across different kinds of hardware, with different characteristics and infrastructures; **Information Internetworking**: Computing for storing, recalling, and communicating information; **People**: Computing meets people, including the design of human-centered systems; and, **Media**: Computing for processing, creating, and presenting multimedia. *Any two threads make up a computer science degree that meets ABET accreditation standards.*

The value of this matrix model is that the thread provides the context for courses in a curriculum. Rather than a required set of core courses that provide breadth within a discipline a threaded curriculum allows for flexibility in combining basic (introductory, methods) courses with more specialized courses in terms of relevance for a given context.

For example, “introductory courses in software engineering do not necessarily make sense for People or Media threads” (Furst, Isbell, & Guzdzial, 2007). The FVTF is calling attention to the ways that such curricula are being implemented in order to make undergraduate

## Departments and “Threaded” curriculum

In the models we looked at for this report we found that universities who have elected to consider threaded programs have done so through a bottom-up process that begins with departments. Departments are the fulcrum of change and innovation in any university. The willingness of program and department faculty to participate in the collective work of curricular innovation is the key to change that will meet the new demands on and forces that are reshaping higher education. See [Appendix 4](#) for more information.

The FVTF realizes that it would be easy to dismiss these models of curricular innovation as too difficult or unrealistic. But these approaches offer multiple advantages and opportunities, including: flexibility in curriculum design, relevance for students and the community, and the capacity to generate basic and applied research opportunities. We offer these models as examples of innovation that are being implemented at other universities, that align with an Anchor Institution approach, and that do not privilege one form of knowledge production over another.

**For recommendations on this section see [page 38](#).**

## **6. LOS ANGELES BASIN WORKFORCE NEEDS**

The President’s charge asked the FVTF to align new programs/curricula with the needs of the Los Angeles region. Los Angeles is certainly one of the more interesting cities in the world: Trends begin here and the city is fantastically diverse. Problems are also writ large in Los Angeles: We may be the nation’s second largest city but our infrastructure, economic development efforts, and private sector growth lag way behind other American metropolises (Los Angeles 2020 Commission, 2013). Los Angeles has not kept up with job creation— the city has a net decline in non-farm related jobs and among the highest unemployment rates in the country (C. Cooper, personal communication, March 21, 2014). Industry data from the Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation (2010, 2013) as well as the recent Los Angeles 2020 Commission’s *A time for truth* (2013), a pessimistic report on the state of the city, describes a lack of transparency and innovation in local government, aging infrastructure, inadequate communication/collaboration among major public entities, and a leadership vacuum. The sobering statistics found in these

---

education relevant for all students. Georgia Tech students experienced better and deeper learning, and the Computer Science program experienced a surge in applications.

reports highlight the inequalities and inequities of class and race that disproportionately affect many CAL STATE L.A. students. These issues are also opportunities for exploration in the curriculum. The city serves as productive terrain for various transdisciplinary studies.

In researching for this report the task force was struck by these statistics. By 2030 over two billion jobs will have disappeared worldwide. Can we count on the creation of enough new jobs to absorb those put out of work?<sup>11</sup> Growth and demand areas of employment indicate a future that is not always easy to embrace. The University and its stakeholders will need to understand the kinds of employment transitions students will be called upon to make and to prepare our students to make them.<sup>11</sup>

These jobs require a sophisticated set of skills, as discussed earlier. Unfortunately, *71% of new and replacement jobs through 2021 in Los Angeles will require less than a college degree* (LAEDC, 2013). What is our role here? Should we be preparing students for a global future working outside of Los Angeles? Area occupations paying a higher median salary will still require at least a Bachelor's degree, but the competition for these jobs will likely be fierce.

Industry clusters within the subset of jobs requiring a college degree that show projected growth in the next decade include business, scientific and technical services, hospitals, social assistance, and education. State and local government work also showed significant projected growth over the next decade as all four levels of government are represented in the city (municipalities, county government, state and federal agencies). The following table lists the growth areas for entry level jobs for college graduates, as predicted by the LAEDC:

---

<sup>11</sup> There is likely to be demand for higher-skill labor in sectors that respond to the following trends:

- *Blending of the digital, the physical, and the subjective worlds.* New software will be required as the digital, the physical, and the subjective increasingly blur.<sup>[1]</sup>
- *Intensive urbanization.* Cities are becoming society's new experimental laboratories. Urban areas are typically more energy efficient per capita than rural areas (Bettencourt, Lobo, Helbing, Kuhnert, & West, 2007). Cities are also more productive per capita, more creative per capita, and richer per capita than rural areas.<sup>[1]</sup>
- *Adaption to and mitigation of the effects of climate change.* These are jobs that range broadly from solar energy production and installation, and engineering and construction to protect against rising sea levels, to construction of desalination plants. This broad area may well create massive demand for labor at all skills levels.
- *Big Data.* Data science is the formal name for the study of "big data," the navigation and extraction or mining of information from massive amounts of data (Los Angeles is becoming a locus for data science startup companies).<sup>[1]</sup>
- *Education.* Technology has galvanized the entire education sector. A new education industry will offer online, jigsaw-puzzle-piece courses that can be combined in multiple ways. Technology will continue to change education in ways now unimaginable.



OCCUPATION	PROJECTED ANNUAL OPENINGS 2012-2017	MEDIAN WAGE
Architecture and Engineering	1,872	\$93,453
Computer and Mathematical	3,126	\$86,603
Sales and Related(securities, commodities, financial sales)	1,017	\$84,042
Education, Training, Library	8,265	\$82,500
Arts, Entertainment, Sports and Media	2,892	\$62,708
Business and Financial	6,567	\$60,430
Community and Social Services, including Health care	1,726	\$49,656

It is not surprising that, across all of the sources of data available to the task force, professional-sector jobs and employment related to urban sustainability were consistently identified as areas of future demand for the Los Angeles metropolitan area. These data are relevant insofar as they remind us that jobs after college are a pressing matter for our students.

**For recommendations on this section [see page 39](#).**

## **7. CULTURE SHIFT**

The writing group identified many institutional processes within and beyond the Division of Academic Affairs that act as barriers to innovation and that prevent the achievement of a truly student-centered curriculum. There exists an ingrained cultural stagnation that has led to excessively bureaucratic structures and processes, all of which create resistance to change, revision and new collaborative ventures. The University lacks a shared identity. If we are to achieve our common goals, periodic renewal, if not a change in campus culture, will be required. Achieving that change will demand a fresh look at processes, organizational forms, attitudes, expectations, assumptions, even traditions, that can and may have become entrenched and resistant to change.

Collaboration is identified as the third initiative in the current University strategic plan (<http://web.calstatela.edu/univ/ppa/publicat/stratplan/>). However, the campus still lacks the organizational structure to support inter-divisional collaboration. Without redesigning some critical elements of infrastructure, innovative programs and initiatives are likely to exist only as “bolt-on” features that leave bureaucratic administrative structures and siloed disciplinary units intact. These

are some of the predominant generators of campus climate, culture, professional identity, and institutional roles.

Fostering and sustaining richer, more meaningful campus collaborations will require a fresh look at elements of the university community, including: 1) mission, 2) opportunities for creating broader and interdisciplinary social networks, 3) integrating structures, 4) rewards, 5) external pressure, and 6) classroom teaching and curriculum design. At CAL STATE L.A. some of these features are more developed with regard to collaboration than others (See Recommendations).

In order to overcome some of the isolating effects of older structures and procedures, campus stakeholders will need opportunities for empowerment. Rethinking, for example, the way we approach transdisciplinary work, can accommodate the continuation of already-existing structures that support professional autonomy, while at the same time allowing all university stakeholders to participate in more open processes (for example, the hubs and threads discussed earlier). The litmus for the success of any structural change will be the degree to which it fosters a commitment to shared understanding, respect for expertise and the willingness and patience to iron out differences (Kezar & Lester, 2009).<sup>12</sup>

We are an academic institution with administrators, faculty, and staff serving different but complementary roles in executing the educational mission of the university. As we share the responsibility for planning and decision-making our collective priority should be to ask: What best practices, now and in the future, enhance student learning and our identity as a quality academic institution? Too often this is *not* the guiding principle by which we operate, and the essential role that each partner plays in the success of the institution is neither acknowledged nor respected. The University needs (a) a culture of trust and increased communication among administrators, faculty, and staff; (b) a culture of planning to practice short, mid, and long-range execution of programs, facilities, and budgets; (c) to flexibly, nimbly, and creatively anticipate and then adjust to changing academic, fiscal, and student climates; (d) to institutionalize and sustain programs and new initiatives; and, (e) to minimize the intrusive and stultifying impact of bureaucratic compliance.

---

<sup>12</sup> Following Kanter (1996), Senge (1990) and scholars Kezar and Lester found that, “perhaps the most important and cited advantages to collaboration are innovation and learning” (2009, p. 9). They emphasized that instead of . . . an assortment of collaborative practices . . . to improve student learning (such as learning communities, service learning, or team teaching), enhance research (interdisciplinary and cross campus research centers), revitalize campus service (community and university partnerships) or improve campus management (business process reengineering or cross functional teams) . . . *one change—toward a reorganized campus—can facilitate all these initiatives* [emphasis added] (p. 41).

The university will need to address its governance and administrative policies, structures, and procedures to improve support for planning and creative initiatives, and support a devolving organizational model wherein the structure/culture of the campus revolves around student-centeredness.

Building a strong institutional campus culture that emphasizes such values as collaboration, mutual respect, and innovation also fosters student engagement (Kuh, 2009; NSSE 2014). When students are fully engaged with their educational institution and when they view themselves as part of a larger university community academically success increases (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

In addition to the barriers to cultural change noted above, we must recognize the CAL STATE L.A. is a commuter campus –for both students and, in many cases for faculty. Commuter status is a known barrier to collaboration and innovation. Less time spent on campus leaves less time for participation in activities outside the classroom, and thus time lost to engage in activities that might generate new ideas and new relationships.

### **Commuter status impacts us all**

There is some evidence that students see CAL STATE L.A. as a primary community, one in which they might like to be more involved (See [Appendix 6](#)). The results of several student focus groups conducted in 2014 for the purpose of the FVTF report reveal that, despite being a commuter campus, CAL STATE L.A. students nonetheless place a high value on the campus community (Ngin, 2014; Tikkanen, 2014; Zelman, 2014). Peer mentoring, including the use of student cohorts, emerges as a powerful support mechanism. An ethnography conducted in 2014 by Dr. ChorSwang Ngin and her ANTH 580 class (the first such campus ethnography), interviewed 62 students from four groups: AB540 students; Sally Casanova pre-doctoral awardees; Super Seniors; and EOP students. Students identified both peer and faculty collaboration as critical to their academic success. A 2012 survey of ECST students found that students valued opportunities to collaborate with peers on projects and competitions and valued the connection the college maintains with local industry. Students who stay on campus stay in school.

**Faculty Advising.** To be successful on campus and after graduation our students need holistic advising from professional staff and from faculty in the program major. Advisement should encompass not just “What courses should I take?” but “How do I prepare for my future?” “What else can I get involved in?” “How do I write a resume?” Or “How do I find a research opportunity?” Faculty are uniquely positioned to address students’ aspirational and future-oriented concerns. In

order to have these kinds of conversations, faculty must be available to students and students must take advantage of faculty time and talent.

The challenge of a commuter campus impacts faculty agency and influence. If faculty view their primary workplace as transitional and if, as a result, they fail to take full advantage of opportunities to interact and share ideas with colleagues, including shared governance, then a sense of community and shared identity will be far more difficult to achieve. Developing and implementing a strong and sustaining vision for our campus cannot happen without a present community of faculty.

In the end, the task of building a collaborative and flourishing culture will be a task for all; faculty, staff, administration as well as students.

**For recommendations on this section see [page 44](#).**

## **8. TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

This section presents FVTF recommendations. Many recommendations address legacy and cultural issues. Culture changes slowly; these recommendations are meant to suggest initial directions. *The task force assumes that none will go forward without considered review by faculty and administrators, and the faculty governing process.*

**Recommendations are organized into six categories:**

- 1. CAL STATE L.A. as an Anchor Institution**
- 2. Civic Engagement and Service Learning**
- 3. Student-centeredness**
- 4. Research and Curriculum**
- 5. LA Workforce needs | New Program Recommendations**
- 6. Encouraging Culture shift**

### **1. CAL STATE LA as an Anchor Institution**

**1.1 Recommendation. Define CAL STATE L.A. as an Anchor Institution and build this designation and its implications into future strategic planning, curriculum and fund-raising efforts.**

**Rationale.** Defining CAL STATE L.A. as an Anchor Institution should help shape and support an expanded focus on urban issues, community and civic engagement and service learning.

An AI focus on place-based circumstances and issues will help students learn how to problem solve collaboratively. This would certainly be an outcome of service learning courses--but a greater emphasis on university-community partnerships that provided students with the skills of collaboration needed to work on complex problems would be innovative in and of itself.

**1.2 Recommendation. Convene a task force to address our Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), Minority-Serving Institution (MSI), and Asian American, Native American and Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) designations.**

**Rationale.** The FVTF was unable to develop a white paper on HSI status. Until the campus has a shared understanding of what the promise of, for example, Hispanic-serving status means for our identity and our campus, we will be unable to move forward with strategic efforts.

**1.3 Recommendation. Establish relationships with other Anchor Institutions in the Los Angeles basin and create an Anchor Institution Alliance (AIA), a group of Anchor Institutions that agree to work together for the benefit of the greater Los Angeles area. Focus, at least initially, on collaboration with other Los Angeles area universities.**

**Rationale.** For innovative programs to succeed we must create a new culture of collaboration both internal to and between the university and the community. An AIA can play a central role in building valuable relationships with potential community partners. Consideration should be given to focusing on first building relationships with academic and research-based organizations where the potential for collaboration may be greatest.

**1.4 Recommendation. As a first step in the movement towards an AIA, the university should create a planning committee of administrators and faculty to develop a proposal and strategy for the new Anchor Institution Alliance (AIA). The committee should consider organizational options, CAL STATE L.A.'s unique role and contributions, and potential partners.**

**Rationale.** A project of this nature will take careful planning and considerable discussion with potential partners. Among other things, the committee should consider the option that CAL STATE

L.A. first focus its collaborative efforts on other universities and research-based organizations. A much broader organization may face challenges of multiple members, needs, cultures, and agendas. One step in forming the alliance will be for each anchor institution to identify the contributions it might make. In particular CAL STATE L.A. must outline what it has to offer.

**1.5 Recommendation. Once established, Anchor Institutions or an AIA should set up ongoing mechanisms or structures that facilitate regional dialogue and collaboration between policymakers and university experts.** One goal of such an exercise might be the formulation of an LA region research agenda.

**Rationale.** Communication between policymakers and researchers is often less than ideal. Working together, policy makers, researchers and relevant others could identify and focus on core challenges and means by which they, collectively, can address those challenges. Research teams could work across departments and universities as appropriate. This could even be a transdisciplinary effort.

**1.6 Recommendation. Create a policy maker/researcher exchange program with Los Angeles and the County.**

**Rationale.** Selected government policymakers could spend six months to a year at CAL STATE L.A. studying and perhaps offering classes/seminars in their area. A CAL STATE L.A. faculty member (graduate student) would spend an equivalent amount of time in a City or County agency, bringing fresh ideas, research findings, and other valued perspectives to the agency. The university participant would also benefit from studying the value and tools of applied research and policy-making.

**1.7 Recommendation. Increase the capacity and expertise of CAL STATE L.A. in urban affairs (See program recommendations).**

**Rationale.** CAL STATE L.A. may have difficulty playing a leading role in an Anchor Institution Alliance and in meeting the overall place-based goals of an urban university without an investment in urban affairs and related areas.

## 2. Civic Engagement

**2.1 Recommendation. Seek the input and wisdom of our surrounding communities as to their aspirations by establishing a task force on collaboration and community engagement.**

**Rationale.** We need to seek structured input from our neighbors on what the vision for the campus—as we impact their respective communities--could be. A task force could work with the Academic Senate on integrating the needs of the community into the University's policies/curriculum so as to achieve a symbiotic relationship.

**2.2 Recommendation. Explore the possibility of transdisciplinary cluster hires across the liberal arts and sciences.**

**Rationale.** Faculty clusters would provide sustainability and viability to community engagement projects. Cluster hires also institutionalize a broader base of knowledge production within the University. This would help to ensure the long term relevance of the University and would expand possibilities for private and public grants as well as advancement/development (donations) opportunities. See, for example, Dominguez Hills' newly created Center for Innovation in STEM Education, (<http://www4.csudh.edu/Assets/CSUDH-Sites/Academic-Affairs/docs/cise-org-chart-091014.pdf>) which includes K-12, community college partners and industry leaders.

**2.3 Recommendation. Ensure that information about civic engagement and service learning efforts undertaken by faculty is sought and considered in RTP reviews.** RTP documents need not require such information, but they should allow for the description of these efforts and for consideration of them in evaluations.

**Rationale:** If civic engagement efforts are to be a hallmark of CAL STATE L.A., then these should be tied to academic success via guidelines and RTP documents approved by the Senate.

**2.4 Recommendation. Recognize the value of applied experience in hiring faculty, including consideration of individuals whose primary professional experiences are outside of academia.**

**Rationale.** There is often great classroom value in practical experience with subject matter. Hires that come to us with practical experience are also likely to be of great value in civic engagement efforts.

Individuals with such experience have significant networks, contacts, and knowledge that can provide insight for students and faculty. Applicants with practical experience may also have solid academic credentials. But even in cases where those credentials are less than what might normally be required, the trade-off may be well worth it.

**2.5 Recommendation. Consider establishing a transdisciplinary CAL STATE L.A. center for research dissemination dedicated to providing Los Angeles area policy-makers with information about policy-relevant research.**

**Rationale.** The information provided could take many forms, including: new research directed specifically at LA urban issues; summaries of recent policy-relevant research; analysis of policy-relevant implications of basic research. Information distributed could come from any academic or credible sources. Graduate students could play a major role in preparation of summaries and analysis of policy-relevant aspects of research. All Departments could participate to the extent they were interested. The Center would establish means of distributing information to the appropriate Los Angeles area policymakers. Conceivably this Center could be associated with the Pat Brown Institute.

### **3. Student-Centeredness**

**3.1 Recommendation. Reaffirm that, at CAL STATE L.A., students come first.** Developmental education, adjustments in faculty hiring and review processes, professional development, innovative teaching approaches and other proposals addressed in this report must all be assessed, first and foremost, based upon their capacity to meet the educational needs, broadly defined, of our students, and to improve the quality of education provided to them. Students should come first at CAL STATE L.A.

**Rationale:** None required.



### **3.2 Recommendation. Fully fund the new GE Pathways program.**

**Rationale.** The recently revised General Education program promises to offer a distinctive and foundational liberal arts education that will serve as the signature “stamp” for CAL STATE L.A. undergraduates. The newly approved program takes a large step towards engaging curricula and reinforcing our image as an urban-serving institution and AI through community service and by providing a focus on complex problems (Pathways). For the new outcomes-based program to reach its full potential with the development of innovative GE Pathways, the implementation of the new GE program must be fully funded; if the university wants this program to succeed, significant resources should be allocated to ensure the creation of Pathways and to ensure the quality of the program through the creation and implementation of a solid assessment program. Since the Pathways approach is designed to be multi- and interdisciplinary, participating faculty need adequate compensation for the work this type of collaboration to be effective.

### **3.3 Recommendation. Address developmental education as a significant social issue for our campus and our community.**

**Rationale.** CAL STATE L.A. should become a national leader in the integration of developmental education programs across curricula. Most of our students are committed to performing well at the university and intellectually, many are on a par with UC students. However, many first-generation students lack academic literacy when they arrive. The pre-college training programs (e.g. EOP) offered on campus are excellent but do not reach every incoming student. The campus could consider redesigning and linking core courses as part of this effort (See 3.4 below).

### **3.4 Recommendation. Cohort all first-year students in composition, communication and math courses to increase community and encourage retention.**

**Rationale:** Research indicates that cohorting first-year students builds a sense of community, improves learning outcomes and helps freshmen persist into their sophomore year. These data alone are worth pursuing a cohorted model for all freshmen at CAL STATE L.A. Extensive planning, program restructuring, and additional full-time staffing of First Year Experience (FYE) would be essential in order to organize and effectively administer such a project.

**3.5 Recommendation. Conduct a full-scale review of student views with regard to our campus community** and the extent to which it is (a) fostering intellectual development, and student success, (b) is conducive to collaboration and the creation of lasting networks, and (c) maximizing the benefits of our diversity, etc. If students express a preference for or perceive value in a richer campus community experience, consider what might be done to accommodate that preference and to address the limitations of community-building on a commuter campus.

**Rationale.** Some information collected by the task force project indicates that students may consider CAL STATE L.A. an important community, and not just in an academic sense. If we are to be engaged with our community, that engagement must start at home with making our campus a place where diversity is valued, learning and growth take place in and outside of classrooms, and students are engaged in collaboration and networking opportunities. The university should do all it can to make our campus and community reflect the community engagement we envision.

**3.6 Recommendation. Encourage and incentivize, where appropriate, the adoption of Supplemental Instruction® (SI) and similar pedagogical strategies such as Peer Led Team Learning (PLTL) and Academic Excellence Workshop (AEW).**

**Rationale.** Peer mentoring improves the academic performance of undergraduates and is a powerful positive variable in minority students' success. Pedagogies like SI (a student-centered pedagogy in which students work in small, peer-led groups to solve problems --University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2014), PLTL and AEW fill multiple gaps in traditional approaches to education. They help students create communities, and provide a form of self-discipline. They encourage student problem solving. They help students learn to work in teams. SI, for example, has been shown to raise student grades, cut time spent on homework, and to reduce significantly the percentage of students receiving D, F, and U grades.

A program that assists faculty in applying and adapting such pedagogies would require a coordinator and training/certification of mentors. Among other things, this training alone would provide a leadership development opportunity for mentors, and reward the natural inclination of our students to assist one another. Community engagement credit could also be considered in lieu of stipends to student mentors.

**3.7 Recommendation. Create a credit-for-work baccalaureate program** in which credit earned by students for what they have learned through independent study, noncredit adult courses, work experience, portfolio demonstration, previous licensure or certification, or completion of other learning opportunities (military, government, or professional).

**Rationale.** Adult students already have had a wide range of college-level learning experiences. The University would attract a new population of adult professionals by offering credit for work experience toward a bachelor's degree. Such a population would add to the diversity of the campus. Currently few universities in the nation offer such programs. Such a program would also fit with a civic engagement, Anchor Institute emphasis. Admittedly, multiple issues over the granting of credit for work would have to be resolved.

**3.8 Recommendation. Remodel physical space to create convenient, spontaneous gathering places for students.**

**Rationale.** There is evidence that students who stay on campus do better in school. While Cal State L.A. is a commuter campus, efforts should be made to maximize the value of the time students spend on campus and address the limitations imposed by commuter campus circumstances.

Students need dedicated space on campus to do school-related work; team projects, especially, require dedicated space. Well designed, comfortable, spontaneous gathering places foster a sense of community and promote collaboration. To the extent possible, gathering spaces should be provided at both the department and broader levels. Ideally, similar space opportunities should exist for faculty and administrative personnel.

**3.9 Recommendation. In hiring faculty, look for candidates who, among other things, indicate a strong interest in and commitment to teaching the students that CAL STATE L.A. serves.**

**Rationale.** We will be best able to achieve our mission in general and in student success, in particular, if we have faculty who are and who remain enthusiastic about teaching our students and who have an abiding interest in working at an institution like CAL STATE L.A.. Faculty who may be seeking primarily research-related opportunities associated with R1, doctoral granting institutions

should certainly be considered and can be an enormous asset to the university. But CAL STATE L.A. must focus on recruiting faculty who are best able to, and most interested in, meeting the needs –educational, mentoring, and others—of our students.

**3.10 Recommendation. Develop a culture wherein our alumni are an integral part of the campus, and alumni are tracked over their professional lives.**

**Rationale.** The relationship of CAL STATE L.A. with its alumni should be strengthened and nurtured. Alumni should serve as the best evidence of the kind of students we help mould. More importantly, when we lose the connections with our students once they graduate we lose endowment opportunities and cultural assets. Alumni who are proud of the institution they attended, especially when they are visible as community leaders, can be an enormous resource. By creating connections between the university and communities they lead or serve our alumni are also of considerable value in civic engagement and service learning efforts, and in generating networking and employment opportunities for newly graduating students.

## **4. Research and Curriculum**

**4.1 Recommendation. Through the faculty shared governance structure: In order to make community engagement a reality on campus, revisit the tenure and promotion process** and examine whether the university in fact broadly supports and rewards multiple forms of scholarship including applied research, the scholarship of teaching and learning, interdisciplinary collaboration, and the scholarship of community engagement.

**Rationale.** As an Anchor Institution, CAL STATE L.A. should consider broadening its tenure criteria to include integration between applied research and teaching as these serve community development. Teaching, research, and service are often treated as distinct and unrelated, with basic research often privileged over and disconnected from the other two (and often at the disparagement of applied research as well).

**4.2 Recommendation. Require and provide, or incentivize, ongoing professional development in effective teaching practices** and innovative teaching strategies—including opportunities in and value of civic engagement and service learning — of all faculty. Professional

development should be provided for administrators, faculty and staff on how to work in an SCU or AI, and in collaborative, learning institution.

**Rationale.** Students need and deserve the best teaching available. Faculty should be strongly encouraged to take advantage of opportunities to learn about innovations in teaching practices and strategies, including high impact teaching strategies.

If faculty are to be encouraged to pursue civic engagement activities they may need help in identifying and maximizing opportunities. To allow for varying interests and needs, faculty should be given a wide choice of learning options. Ideally, they should get release time (perhaps two units every other year). If civic engagement efforts are to be a hallmark of CAL STATE L.A., then these should be tied to academic success via guidelines and RTP documents approved by the Senate.

**4.3 Recommendation. Develop incentives for departments to hire faculty with expertise in multiple forms of scholarship that include applied research** (especially for departments where basic research is predominant), the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), trans-disciplinary collaboration, and the scholarship of community engagement.

**Rationale.** This would strengthen the mission of the University as a State Comprehensive University and as an Anchor Institution. It would diversify opportunities to fund faculty research and interdisciplinary programs and it would foster greater collaboration across colleges.

**4.4 Recommendation. Articulate the process by which new faculty are hired for trans-, multi- or interdisciplinary work.**

**Rationale.** While the campus technically hires to the teacher-scholar model there is no explicit framework for hiring for trans- or interdisciplinary work. If the campus pursues more collaborative initiatives hiring practice should be revisited. Faculty should be hired specifically as trans- or interdisciplinary faculty whose primary department is the interdisciplinary unit itself, so as to eliminate possible conflicting reward structures. Any joint-appointments should be well articulated in campus policy.

Job ads could specify that experience in team-based teaching and team-based research is a desirable or required qualification.

#### **4.5 Recommendation. Explore flexible/open structures for curriculum connected to trans- or multidisciplinary research.**

**Rationale.** There is increasing demand for flexibility in the delivery of knowledge content to undergraduate students. There is also increasing evidence that context-based learning allows students to transfer the knowledge and skills they learn in one context to other context. Context-based learning also facilitates deeper learning (Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 2000). Finally, flexible curriculum would allow students to experience the value of trans- and multidisciplinary problem solving and to develop 21st Century skills of teamwork in a real world context. All of this would distinctively advantage students for entry into 21st century professions.

## **5. LA Workforce needs | New Programs**

### **Preconditions for New Programs**

The committee recognizes that generating proposals for new programs was a major part of our charge. With that goal in mind we spent time collecting and reviewing information that would enable us to offer recommendations. These include a consultant's report (See [Appendix 3](#)). However, the writing committee does not feel it has the expertise or resources to lay out specific university priorities in this area, at least not with any substantial degree of confidence.

We have chosen instead to suggest and briefly discuss some program recommendations that we believe –based on the information we have reviewed and the President’s charge—are worthy of serious consideration. Our criteria included programs offered *nowhere* else in the local area and workforce needs. Possible programs we identify are intended to be flexible and collaborative. The best recommendations 1) meet the needs of the Los Angeles basin; 2) draw upon the expertise of multiple frameworks or disciplines; and, 3) are not necessarily limited to a degree conferral, but may include options, certificates, and/or minors.

We begin with suggestions for general principles that might be applied to many, if not all, new program alternatives.

**Seeking community input.** We must be careful to begin with the needs and aspirations of the community that we serve. Our students form our first community. With rare exceptions, all proposals for new programs should be first judged against their potential value to our students. Beyond our students, the community we service as multiple needs: education, shelter, health care

and the provision of services, employment and workforce development. The University can work collaboratively with residents, community organizations, nonprofits, local government, and other anchor institutions to identify assets and prioritize needs.

**Trans- and Interdisciplinary program differences.** Many of the following options for new programs are transdisciplinary or interdisciplinary in focus. The task force affirms these collaborative approaches as one way of breaking down silos. These will need to be fully funded and their structures carefully considered, including whether or not these programs should be housed in a single department.

Although such programs allow for innovation inside of a traditional department structure, it is worth noting that the interdisciplinary program model is currently *not* supported by this university. They exist in a limbo outside university departmental structures. They lack operating budgets, and have no direct access to IRA funds, Student Success fees, or any form of support. They must negotiate with department chairs for all resources. They have no dedicated faculty or staff, which means they must borrow departmental faculty--reducing the number of classes those faculty members can teach in their department. They often place additional demands on overburdened ASCs. In order for interdisciplinary programs to succeed on this campus, the current policy which allows only departments to receive and apply for funding and to hire faculty and staff would have to be amended to allow interdisciplinary programs fair access to resources and governance. The efforts of faculty and staff who do work in innovative interdisciplinary programs, including start-up efforts, would have to be recognized and supported.

**Scaling programs for sustainability.** Transdisciplinary efforts could be gathered and governed by a center on campus, either a new Center for Innovation or an existing center, such as that of Center for Engagement, Service Learning and the Public Good.

**Funding.** Many recommendations offered here will require a substantial outlay of resources. The task force anticipates that much-welcome advancement efforts by the institution to raise capital funds will provide start-ups for any new program, Institute or approaches. However, we also recognize that, as a state-supported institution, revenue challenges will be a way of life. Therefore, the University colleges should also make a good faith effort to prioritize their current programs as these mesh with any new campus vision. Additionally, the university community must endeavor to make the most of available resources by performing all its obligations in the most efficient manner possible and by reforming or eliminating inefficient and duplicative structures and processes.

## **New Program Recommendations**

**The first two recommendations in this section are meant to address the outlay of resources that any new programs would entail. Considerations for new programs follow.**

**5.1 Recommendation. Develop a large and diverse funding base to support new Academic Affairs programs and initiatives.**

**Rationale.** The Administration should aggressively diversify its funding sources to include increases in support through grants and contracts, philanthropy, industry, appropriate/responsible entrepreneurship, and other sources. Other state institutions have been able to provide opportunities for student along with institutional growth and excellence while receiving much lower proportion of their overall budget from the state than we do.

Diversifying knowledge production (with faculty research expertise in basic, applied, engaged, and teaching and learning) also increases opportunities for external funding.

**5.2 Recommendation. Faculty from among the Liberal Arts and Sciences should convene a task force to address public humanities, workforce needs, and how it might best respond to the President's visioning charge.** We believe that following the strategic plan and the charge led us to more recommendations in other fields than the liberal arts and humanities. Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty are in the best position to articulate visionary liberal arts programs.

## **New Program Considerations**

**5.3 An Urban Studies Bachelor's degree program approved by the CO Master Plan for 2016 and/or an environmental studies/science program with an urban focus.** A transdisciplinary urban environmental science/studies program would concentrate on environment-related issues using scientific, social scientific and humanistic approaches. CAL STATE L.A. has the opportunity to distinguish itself nationally given its location and population.

**Rationale.** While the majority of the new program put forth for consideration below are ideas--indications of need based on the analysis--the FVTF believes that the Urban Studies focus is of primary importance and forms a centerpiece around which the other programs, *et al*, could be ordered. See, especially, the prior discussions of Anchor Institutions, Civic Engagement and Service Learning, and workforce needs. It should be acknowledged that a program of this nature



will require significant resources and commitment; other recommendations may demand less of both.

#### **5.4 Transdisciplinary programs in Health/Health Care Management and Community Health and Wellness**

**Rationale.** The youngest baby boomers are retirement aged, which will intensify the need for qualified health care personnel in the country (US New and World Reports, 2014). The Bureau of Labor Statistics also reports that jobs in health care support will experience substantial occupational growth in the coming years.

CAL STATE L.A. currently offers an MS in Health/Health care Administration/Management but no Bachelor's degree. This is a concern given that we predominantly serve an undergraduate population. An undergraduate degree should be offered in partnership with the Department of Public Health.

A transdisciplinary degree in Community Health and Wellness would be unique in the basin, if not the state. It could be offered at both undergraduate and graduate levels by the disciplines of Public Health, Nutrition and Kinesiology, with possible participation of other disciplines (*e.g.* Social Work, Nursing, Sociology, Psychology, and Management).

Preliminary discussions with students indicate that these programs would generate considerable student interest and demand. Moreover, given the multiple health care challenges in Los Angeles County emerging in the next decade, both would be of great value to the community and public officials. The fields also offer great opportunity for Civic Engagement efforts and for interdisciplinary collaborations.

#### **5.5 A Bachelor's and Master's program in Service Science.**

**Rationale.** The emerging field of service science focuses on the service sector, one of the fastest growing economic sectors and is, almost by definition, interdisciplinary. It brings together multiple disciplines, and spans government, private, and nonprofit sectors. A service science program could train students to work to fill gaps in services not currently provided by existing institutions. If organized according to assets and needs in local communities it could contribute to the development of human and economic capital for CAL STATE L.A.'s partner communities and

institutions. The service sector is broad, ranging from human services (government, health, nonprofit) to entertainment and media, to information technology, to finance, insurance, real estate, to professional (legal, accounting, management consulting), to retail, and education. In short, a program of this nature holds great promise for wide interdisciplinary collaboration and for meeting workforce and student career needs.

#### **5.6 A Master's program (MS) in Nonprofit Management with an expanded emphasis on public administration and government-related careers.**

**Rationale.** There is no such program offered by the CSU. An interdisciplinary program in nonprofit management would prepare graduates to manage nonprofit organizations including foundations, educational institutions, associations, hospitals, and many others. This program is not currently offered by any CSU and only two other schools in the LA basin have a similar program (Eduventures, 2014). Los Angeles has a sizeable social services sector, and government is a growth area (LAEDC, 2010; 2014). Our service area might benefit particularly from such a program. This program would also provide multiple opportunities for civic engagement and service learning activities.

Los Angeles is a focal point for national, state, county, and multiple city governments. These governments—their agencies, departments, etc.—are a major employer in the region. As an Anchor Institution with a focus on the Los Angeles region, the university should consider how our academic programs might best meet the workforce needs of both the public sector and the career aspirations of many of our students.

**5.7 An interdisciplinary MS in Sports and Fitness Management** that prepares individuals to apply business, coaching and physical education principles to the organization, administration and management of athletic programs and teams, fitness/rehabilitation facilities and health clubs, and sports recreation.

**Rationale.** This program is not offered by any CSU. This program targets a number of projected growth areas in the LAEDC study and might find considerable support among the many CAL STATE L.A. students interested in sports, fitness and/or business.

### **5.8 An interdisciplinary BA in Informatics**

**Rationale.** Informatics is a growing field and one identified by the task force in its workforce analysis as a demand area. Informatics focuses on computer systems from a user-centered perspective and studies the structure, behavior and interactions of natural and artificial systems. An informatics program would focus on user-centered computer systems. There is no such program offered by the CSU.

### **5.9 A transdisciplinary Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship Program**

**Rationale.** The emerging and nascent field of social innovation and social entrepreneurship is at the cross-roads of non-profit, government, public and private sectors. This transdisciplinary program prepares students to actively engage with the community by diagnosing pressing social problems and providing innovative, sustainable, scalable solutions. Service learning and community-based research projects are an integral part of this program. The program would require a transdisciplinary approach as no single discipline can provide the necessary knowledge skills and abilities.

### **5.10 Implementation of the proposed Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies major.**

**Rationale.** This program is already in the degree pipeline. We include it here because there is no workplace that does not need people trained in issues of diversity. As outlined in “Collaboration Across Disciplines, Departments, and Colleges” in Section 5 above, Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies holds considerable potential for transdisciplinary activity, for Civic Engagement/Service Learning pedagogies and for study of local, or local-global urban issues.

## **6. Culture shift**

The Committee believes that it will be extremely difficult to successfully create and implement many of the recommendations offered in this visioning report or in the university strategic plan without a big shift in culture that includes new policies and commitments aimed at increasing, among other things, collaboration, innovation, and efficiency. Everyone has a role to play.

**6.1 Recommendation. Help faculty and administration to build a shared vision of the university and an appreciation of the roles each play to bring it about.** Professional development should include both faculty and administrators whenever possible.

**Rationale.** Collaboration, a stated goal of the strategic plan, should include both faculty and administrators. Shared governance is demanded in the resource-strapped landscape of California higher education. It is in the best interests of both faculty and administration where appropriate to engage in collaborative efforts to address campus issues and opportunities. Such collaboration needs to occur with a new spirit, free of the acrimony that has sometimes marked administration/faculty relations in the past. Projects, such as this visioning task force might benefit from participation of both administration and faculty.

**6.2 Recommendation. Develop the leadership potential of our colleagues to empower campus leaders.**

**Rationale.** Faculty who aspire to leadership roles are uncommon in the Academy (Bolman & Gallos, 2011; Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch & Tucker, 1999, Kezar & Carducci, 2006). Leadership vacuums create the need to hire outside the campus. Failing to develop future leaders from within the campus, including faculty, is not in the long term interest of the campus. In many universities, succession planning is a historical problem exacerbated by the reluctance to lead. Shared governance is also negatively impacted. As one provost noted in the higher education press, "Faculty members want leadership that emerges from their ranks, yet they don't encourage (and often actively discourage) peers and charges to develop the skills, knowledge, and desire to lead. If there are no people at this intersection, institutional boards in particular will seek leadership solutions elsewhere" (Barden & Curry, 2013, A).

To forward the mission of the University the following development might be an expectation: fundraising training for Chairs and future Chairs; succession planning for Chairs; development for all new Chairs, and continued professional development for all Academic Affairs leaders that develops them as effective managers, including the Deans and Associate Deans. As key stakeholders, administrators and faculty should be empowered to take a proactive role in the efficient management of the University. The FVTF invites the Academic Senate to explicate a means of involving more faculty in academic governance.

**6.3 Recommendation. Determine how faculty, administration and staff organizational responsibilities can be streamlined or reduced.**

**Rationale.** If faculty and administrators are going to find the time and energy to pursue the kinds of innovative, transdisciplinary strategies and pedagogies advocated in this report, some other responsibilities may have to be reduced. Granting released time is one option, but it can be costly. Options to improve efficiency and to reduce administrative burdens, thereby saving and releasing faculty time, should be vigorously considered and pursued.

**6.4 Recommendation. Colleges should be encouraged to provide or consider advisement in relationship to workload.**

**Rationale.** Faculty play an integral role in advisement. The electronic survey of students (N=1,483) and focus groups revealed students who wanted more meaningful advice related to their personal and professional aspirations— and look to faculty for this advice. Faculty need professional development in order to better understand our student population. Faculty and staff advisors can work together to educate each other about best practices in student advisement. Any professional development should work with faculty on holistic advising.

To better address student needs and to make the most out of faculty advisement efforts, faculty can and should act as mentors. Faculty advising should focus primarily on student aspirations, career guidance, unique student interests, challenges and opportunities and other such mentoring-type activities.

**6.5 Recommendation. Through the faculty shared governance structure, consider means by which all faculty members are encouraged to perform at the highest level and to participate fully, according to their interests and skill sets, in the larger university community.**

**Rationale.** If CAL STATE L.A. is going to meet the challenges and opportunities outlined in this report the University will need high quality performance from all university personnel.

**6.6 Recommendation. Encourage and enable adjunct faculty to participate, to the extent practicable in the university community.**

**Rationale.** In several colleges adjunct faculty form a sizeable part of the total faculty members. Many of the Non-tenure track faculty (NTTFs) have rich career, community and/or intellectual experiences and would appreciate opportunities to more than willing to contribute to the progress of the University. Some of them also serve as valuable liaisons to the community organizations and businesses, to other universities and to government.

**6.7 Recommendation. Reorganize office space to mix departments from different colleges and to mix administration with faculty.**

**Rationale.** It serves a department well to keep the offices of its faculty in close proximity. The department is the core community unit on campus. But it would probably be useful to mix departments (especially those engaged in interdisciplinary efforts) rather than keeping all departments from the same college together or each department in a college separated from the others. Consideration might be given to incorporating administration offices with faculty offices.

**6.8 Recommendation. In the conversion to semesters, continue the policy of scheduling a block of time where few—or no--classes are scheduled in order to encourage extra-curricular activity.**

**Rationale.** Finding a time when everyone can meet for various collaborative activities is helped by the current "dead hour". Building a sense of a valued campus community –for students, faculty, staff and administration—may require the provision of free time during which all can occasionally engage in activities that help to strengthen that community and open the doors to new relationships, collaborative efforts, and ongoing innovation. Because we are a commuter campus, for both faculty and students this small innovation is vital to campus community.

**6.9 Recommendation. In order to move the visioning work of the campus forward, convene other ad hoc task forces to explore campus issues and needs, and to offer informed recommendations.** These task forces should have directed and limited agendas and guidance about the purpose and process of a task force.

**Rationale.** The work of the FVTF is just starting. The small group charged with writing this report found it to be an extremely rewarding exercise. They benefitted from the opportunity it afforded to offer input on major university options and from the opportunity to engage in an ongoing and

challenging interdisciplinary exercise with colleagues. We believe others will derive similar benefits from such experiences and campus relationships, and that our campus community will be strengthened.

In most cases, assigned tasks should be narrowly defined and, absent financial support, highly focused. Task forces might be structured as small discussion groups amongst individuals having interest in and usually some experience or expertise in the subject matter. Groups should generally be kept small to increase accountability and require full participation of all concerned, and should include faculty, administrators, staff and students as appropriate.

## **9. REFERENCES**

About Storying Sheffield. (n.d.). *Storying Sheffield: Telling Untold Tales*. Retrieved from <http://www.storyingsheffield.com/about/>

Alliance for Regional Stewardship, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. (2006). *Making place matter: Tools and insights for universities called to regional stewardship*. Retrieved from <http://www.aascu.org/publications/regionalstewardship/>

Anchor Institutions Task Force/ Marga Incorporated (AITF/Marga). (2013). *Anchor institutions: An interpretive review essay*. Retrieved from [http://www.margainc.com/files\\_images/general/Literature\\_Review\\_2013.pdf](http://www.margainc.com/files_images/general/Literature_Review_2013.pdf).

Arts Enterprise: Current Projects. (n.d.). *Arts Enterprise*. Retrieved from <http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/artsenterprise/projects>

Attewell, P., Lavin, D., Domina, T., & Levey, T. (2006). New evidence on college remediation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 886-924. Retrieved from <http://www.ohiostatepress.org>

Axelroth, R., & Dubb, S. (2010). *The road half traveled: University engagement at a crossroads*. College Park, MD: The Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland. Retrieved

from [http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-dubb-howard\\_0.pdf](http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-dubb-howard_0.pdf)

Bardem, D. M., & Curry, M. (April 8, 2013). Faculty members can lead, but will they? *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Faculty-Members-Can-Lead-but/138343/>

Bardo, J. W. (1990). *Defining the missions of AASCU institutions*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Barnes, R. A., & Piland, W. E. (2013). Learning communities' impact on student success in developmental English. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37, 954-965. doi:10.1080/10668926.2010.491994

Bettencourt, L. M. A., Lobo, J., Helbing, D., Kuhnert, C., & West, G. B. (2007). Growth, innovation, scaling, and the pace of life in cities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 7301-7306. Retrieved from <http://www.pnas.org/>

Birch, E., Perry, D. C., & Taylor, H. L., Jr. (2013). Universities as anchor institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17(3), 7-15. Retrieved from <http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/>

Bolman, L. G., & Gallos, J. V. (2011). *Reframing academic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from [http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\\_id=9853&page=R2](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=9853&page=R2)

Shapiro, J., Morrison, E. H., & Boker, J. R. (2004). Teaching empathy to first year medical students: Evaluation of an elective literature and medicine course. *Education for Health*, 17(1), 73-84.

Borangiu, T., Drăgoicea, M., Oltean, E., & Iacob, I. (2013, February). A model for open, on-demand, collaborative education for service science. In J. Falcão e Cunha, M. Snene, & H.



- Nóvoa (Eds.), *Exploring services science: Proceedings of 4th International Conference, IESS 2013*, Porto, Portugal. *Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing* 143 (pp. 306-312). Berlin Germany: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Boyer, Ernest L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Calhoun, C. (2011). The public mission of the research university. In D. Rhoten & C. Calhoun (Eds.), *Knowledge matters: The public mission of the research university*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Calleson D. C., Kauper-Brown, J. & Seifer, S.D. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship toolkit. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health. Retrieved from [www.communityengagedscholarship.info](http://www.communityengagedscholarship.info)
- Cantor, N., Englot, P., & Higgins, M. (2013). Making the work of anchor institutions stick: Building coalitions and collective expertise. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17(3), 17-46 .Retrieved from <http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/>
- Clark, L.B. (2008). Report of the cluster/interdisciplinary advisory committee to evaluate the cluster hiring initiative. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved from [http://clusters.wisc.edu/documents/ClusterReport\\_2008.pdf](http://clusters.wisc.edu/documents/ClusterReport_2008.pdf).
- Civic Science. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://civic-science.org/>
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Sullivan, W. M., & Dolle, J. R. (2011). *Rethinking undergraduate business education: Liberal learning for the profession*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/ Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Community-Wealth.org (n.d.). *Overview: University & and community partnerships*. Retrieved from <http://community-wealth.org/strategies/panel/universities/index.html>
- Community-Wealth.org. (n.d.). *Overview: Anchor institutions*. Retrieved from <http://community-wealth.org/strategies/panel/anchors/index.html>

- Cruz, L., Ellern, G. D., Ford, G., Moss, H., & White, B. J. (2013). Navigating the boundaries of the scholarship of engagement at a regional comprehensive university. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17(1), 3-26. Retrieved from <http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/>
- Dalhstrom, E., Walker, J. D., & Dziuban, C. (2013). *ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology, 2013*. Louisville, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Analysis and Research. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/ecar>
- Dede, C. (2010). Comparing frameworks for 21st century skills. In *21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn*, (pp. 51-76). Retrieved from [http://watertown.k12.ma.us/dept/ed\\_tech/research/pdf/ChrisDede.pdf](http://watertown.k12.ma.us/dept/ed_tech/research/pdf/ChrisDede.pdf)
- DeMillo, R. A. (2013). *From Abelard to Apple: The fate of American colleges and universities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Ellison, J., & Eatman, T. K. (2008). *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university*. Syracuse, NY: Imagining America.
- Empowered Communities Program. (2014). *Neighborhood empowerment network*. Retrieved from <http://empowersf.org/ecp/>
- European Commission. (2003). *Science shops: Knowledge for the Community. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities*. Retrieved from <http://www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/scienceshop-brochure.pdf>.
- Friedman, T.L. (23 October 2010). The election that wasn't. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Furst, M., & DeMillo, R. A. (2006). Creating symphonic-thinking computer science graduates for an increasingly competitive global environment. Retrieved from <http://www.cc.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/Threads%20Whitepaper.pdf>

- Furst, M., Isbell, C. & Guzdial, M. (2007). Threads: How to restructure a computer science curriculum for a flat world. *Proceedings of the 38th SIGCSE technical symposium on Computer science education*, 420-428. New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Gibson, Cynthia M. (2006). *New times demand new scholarship: Research universities and civic engagement—A leadership agenda*. Boston, MA: Tufts University and Campus Compact.
- Georgia Institute of Technology, College of Computing, College of Computing. (2005-2014). *Threads combinations matrix*. Retrieved from <http://www.cc.gatech.edu/sites/default/files/Threads%20chart.jpg>
- Hagedorn, L. S., Cypers, S., & Lester, J. (2008). Looking in the review mirror: Factors affecting transfer for urban community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32, 643-664.
- HanleyBrown, F., Kania, J., & KraMer, M. (2012, January 26). Channeling change: Making collective impact work. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved from [http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/channeling\\_change\\_making\\_collective\\_impact\\_work](http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/channeling_change_making_collective_impact_work)
- HealthyCity.org. (2012). *Nonprofit Infrastructure: Nonprofit revenue by type of nonprofit for 90022 and 90063 zip codes, Internal Revenue Service, 2006*. Retrieved from <http://www.healthycity.org>
- Hecht, I. W. D., Higgerson, M. L., Gmelch, W. H., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Henderson, B. (2009). The work of the people's university. *Teacher-Scholar*, 1, 5-29. Retrieved from [http://www.fhsu.edu/teacher-scholar/current/volume1/volume1\\_assets/Introduction.pdf](http://www.fhsu.edu/teacher-scholar/current/volume1/volume1_assets/Introduction.pdf)
- Hessels, L. K., & Van Lente, H. (2008). Re-thinking new knowledge production: A literature review and a research agenda. *Research policy*, 37(4), 740-760.

- Higher Education: The University of Sheffield. (n.d.). *The Parliamentary Review*. Retrieved from <http://theparliamentaryreview.co.uk/higher-education/sheffield.html>
- Holley, K. A. (2009). Interdisciplinary strategies as transformative change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 34(5), 331-344. Retrieved from: [http://bama.ua.edu/~kaholley/Interdisciplinarity\\_files/Holley.interdisciplinary.strategies.pdf](http://bama.ua.edu/~kaholley/Interdisciplinarity_files/Holley.interdisciplinary.strategies.pdf)
- Huber, B. (2010). *Does participation in multiple high impact practices affect student success at Cal State Northridge?* Northridge, CA: California State University, Northridge, Office of Institutional Research. Retrieved from <http://www.calstate.edu/engage/documents/csun-study-participation-in-multiple-high-impact-practices.pdf>
- Imagining America. (n.d.) "Full Participation." *Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life*. Retrieved from <http://imaginingamerica.org/research/full-participation/>
- Irvine, J., Martin, B.R. (1984). *Foresight in Science: Picking the Winners*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 1(9), 36-41. Retrieved from <http://www.ssireview.com/>
- Kezar, A. J. (2005). Redesigning for collaboration within higher education institutions: An exploration into the developmental process. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 831-860. doi:10.1007 /s11162-004-6227-5
- Kezar, A. J. (2008). *Rethinking leadership in a complex, multicultural, and global environment: New concepts and models for higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Kezar, A. J., & Carducci, R. (2006). *Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership: ASHE higher education report*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. (2002). Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sensemaking, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education*, 43, 295-328.

- Kezar, A. J., & Lester, J. (2009). *Organizing higher education for collaboration: A guide for campus leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Klein, J. A. (2008). Evaluating of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 35(2S):S116 –S123).
- Larson, D. (2013). *Multi-disciplinary education at Cal Poly: Next steps*. Retrieved from [http://works.bepress.com/debra\\_larson/2](http://works.bepress.com/debra_larson/2)
- Levine, A., & Dean, D. R. (2012). *Generation on a tightrope: A portrait of today's college student*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation. (2010). *The next decade: Industries and occupations for the Los Angeles workforce: Final report*. Los Angeles, CA: Author. Retrieved from [http://laedc.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/2011\\_TheNextDecade.pdf](http://laedc.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/2011_TheNextDecade.pdf)
- Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation. (2013). *Industry and labor market intelligence for Los Angeles County*. Los Angeles, CA: Author. Retrieved from [http://laedc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Industry-and-Labor-Market-Intelligence\\_LA\\_CITY\\_DOC.pdf](http://laedc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Industry-and-Labor-Market-Intelligence_LA_CITY_DOC.pdf)
- Lyons, K. A. (2010). *Service science in iSchools*. Paper presented at iSchools iConference, Doctoral Colloquium, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Retrieved from <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/14946>
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from [http://www.aacu.org/civic\\_learning/crucible/](http://www.aacu.org/civic_learning/crucible/)
- Netter Center for Community Partnerships. (2008). *Anchor institutions toolkit: A guide for neighborhood revitalization*. Philadelphia, PA: Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania.

- Ngin, C. S. (2014, Spring). *Anthropology 580: An ethnography of student learning experiences at Cal State L.A.: Successes and challenges*. Los Angeles, CA: California State University, Los Angeles.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 479-510.doi:10.1007/s11162-005-3362-6
- O'Meara, K. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*. New York, NY: Springer.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Rice, E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Orfield, G. (2004). *Dropouts in America: Confronting the graduation rate crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Ornelas, A., & Solorzano, D. G. (2004). Transfer conditions of Latina/o community college students: A single institution case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28, 233-248.
- Pérez, P.A. & Ceja, M.A. (Eds.). (2010). *Higher education access and choice for Latino students: Critical findings and theoretical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Pinheiro, Romulo. (2012). International transformation and external engagement: Building a new university. Oslo, Norway: Higher Education Institutional Dynamics and Knowledge Cultures Working Papers/ University of Oslo. Retrieved from <http://www.uv.uio.no/english/research/groups/heik/heik-working-paper-series/>
- Rendón, L. I. (1994). Validating cultural diverse students: Toward a new model of learning and student development. *Innovative Higher Education*, 19, 33-50.

- Rendón, L. I. (2002). Community College Puente: A validating model of education. *Educational Policy*, 16, 642-667.
- Penn Institute for Urban Research. (2010). *Anchor institutions and their role in metropolitan change*. Retrieved from <http://penniuur.upenn.edu/uploads/media/anchor-institutions-and-their-role-in-metropolitan-change.pdf>
- Pew Research Internet Project. (2014). *Digital life in 2025*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/03/11/digital-life-in-2025/>
- Posner, B. Z., & Kouzes, J. M. (1988). Development and validation of the Leadership Practices Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48,483-496.
- Rip, A. (2004). Strategic research, post-modern universities and research training. *Higher Education Policy*, 17 (2), 153–166.
- Seifer, S. D., Blanchard, L. W., Jordan, C., Gelmon, S., & McGinley, P. (2012). Faculty for the engaged campus: Advancing community-engaged careers in the academy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 5-20. Retrieved from <http://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/>
- Steinberg, K. S., Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. S. (2011, Fall). Civic-minded graduate: A north star. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19-33.
- Sturm, S. P. (2007). The architecture of inclusion: Interdisciplinary insights on pursuing institutional citizenship. *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*, 30, 248-334. Retrieved from <http://www.law.harvard.edu/studorgs/wlj>
- Sturm, S. (2009). Activating systemic change toward full participation: The pivotal role of boundary spanning institutional intermediaries. *St. Louis University Law Journal*, 54, 1117-1138. Retrieved from <http://www.slu.edu/colleges/law/journal/>
- The Civil Rights Project at UCLA. (2014). *The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles*. Retrieved from <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/>

- Tikkanen, W. (2014, May 15). General Chemistry 101 focus group.(unpublished).
- Tracy, S. (2011). *Service Systems and social enterprise: Beyond the economics of business* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada). Retrieved from [https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/31608/3/Tracy\\_Stephen\\_M\\_201111\\_MI\\_thesis.pdf](https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/31608/3/Tracy_Stephen_M_201111_MI_thesis.pdf)
- Tyner, K. (2009). *Literacy in a digital world: Teaching and learning in the age of information*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- University of Missouri-Kansas City. (2014). *International center for supplemental instruction*. Retrieved from <http://www.umkc.edu/ASM/si/index.shtml>
- Votruba, J. C., Bailey, J. I., Bergland, B. W., Gonzalez, A., Haynes, K. S., Howard, M. A., . . . & Siegel, B. L. (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place: A guide for leading public engagement at state colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from <http://www.aascu.org/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=5458>
- Wadhwa, V. (2014, July 21). Innovations: We're heading into a jobless future, no matter what the government does. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>
- Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G.M. (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They're not magic. *Review of Educational Research*, 81: 267-301.
- Young, J.R. (2014, August 5). Are courses outdated? MIT considers offering 'modules' instead. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/are-courses-outdated-mit-considers-offering-modules-instead/54257>
- Yosso, T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8, 69-91.



Yosso, T. (2006). *Critical race counterstories along the Chicana/Chicano educational pipeline*. New York: Routledge.

Zelman, W. (2014, May 29). *Public Health focus group*.(unpublished).

## Appendix 1: Three Roles Universities can play in Anchor-Based Community Development

Figure 1: Three Roles of Universities in Anchor-Based Community Development			
Key Issues	University as Facilitator	University as Leader	University as Convener
The Engaged Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispersed partnerships rather than geographic focus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on adjacent neighborhood</li> <li>Revitalization often initiated in response to crisis or threatening conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted efforts often focus on non-adjacent neighborhood</li> <li>Strategic choice to engage (not required by history or immediate threat)</li> </ul>
Partnership Programs and Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on scholarly engagement, education and health partnerships, and in-kind resources to build local capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on comprehension neighborhood revitalization- especially education, health, and community development-through academic and non-academic resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on capacity building, as part of neighborhood revitalization</li> <li>Education and health partnerships often part of broader agenda</li> </ul>
Institutional Support and Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong administrative support for broad civic engagement mission</li> <li>Designated community partnership center with focus often on scholarly engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong administrative support often directly overseeing revitalization efforts.</li> <li>Additional partnership centers promote university wide engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate-to-high administrative support often with designated high-powered staff to oversee revitalization efforts</li> <li>Additional partnership centers promote university wide engagement</li> </ul>
Funding and Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low endowment</li> <li>Limited budget</li> <li>Limited corporate investments</li> <li>Moderate leveraging of external resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate-to-high endowment</li> <li>High budget</li> <li>Significant corporate investments</li> <li>Internal investment leverages considerable external resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate-to-high endowment</li> <li>Moderate budget</li> <li>Moderate corporate investments</li> <li>Significant leveraging of external resources</li> </ul>
Principles of Economic Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasize access to education</li> <li>Limited but focused efforts towards support of small and local business owners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasize innovative corporate practices for community economic development (e.g., local purchasing, real estate development)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasize capacity building</li> <li>Developing targeted corporate practices that support diversity, with increasing focus on local community</li> </ul>
Nature of Community Relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good neighbor: responsive to community's or city's agenda</li> <li>Typically reactive (partnership "taker," not "maker")</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University agenda setting</li> <li>Strong community dialogue, but plans often presented "to them" rather than developed "with them"</li> <li>Hire from within rather than community.</li> <li>Create stand-alone organizations to pursue agenda; heavily brand efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-agenda setting among university and community partners</li> <li>Hire community people work in partnership centers—Translator function</li> <li>Partner with new or existing community organizations with shared leadership; low-key branding</li> </ul>
Impacts on Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large-number of nonprofits benefit from partnerships</li> <li>Neighborhood-wide impacts difficult to measure due to extensive geography of effort</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant university interventions in community development, public health and K-12 schooling show promising indicators</li> <li>Major improvements in public safety</li> <li>Often result in higher real estate values in target areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial increase in nonprofit and community capacity</li> <li>Efforts centered on target neighborhood(s) relatively new, making long term impact difficult to assess</li> </ul>

## **Appendix 2: Examples of Public Engagement in the Arts, Humanities, and Design**

The following examples were compiled by the professional association *Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life*. *Imagining America* is unique in its focus on knowledge production based on collaboration between artists, scholars, civil servants and government workers, non-profit workers, and businesses to produce universally relevant, but locally specific, and applied knowledge in the Arts and Humanities intended to meliorate local issues. It is an innovative (if not also new) form of knowledge production that signals the growing importance of paradigms for scholarship and knowledge production that emphasize research for strategic purposes (as opposed to the advancement of knowledge in general, for its own sake) and local impact. At this early stage of the growth of new modes of knowledge production like engaged arts and humanities, strategic research and civic science, it seems clear that an additional kind of knowledge that these approaches are producing is knowledge about the nature of transdisciplinary and cross-sector collaboration itself, and knowledge about engaged, strategically focused research.

*Public History of Slavery*: An international symposium on the subject complemented the publication of James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton, eds., *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory*. Lonnie Bunch, former president of the Chicago Historical Society, director of the Smithsonian Museum of African American History and Culture, and co-editor of a publication series on the New Public Scholarship, keynoted that symposium. Regional sites of such work include the Harriet Wilson Project in New Hampshire, a community-based organization that collaborates with the Center for New England Culture at the University of New Hampshire. At Brown University, Professor James Campbell, at the instigation of President Ruth Simmons, led the Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice in a research project on the university as a “site of conscience” inseparable from its city and region, leading to the production of

rich documentary and curricular resources.

*Theater.* New WORLD Theater (NWT) was founded in 1979 by Roberta Uno, then a faculty member at U-Mass Amherst. In 1995, NWT began a commitment to Southeast Asian, Latino, and Black youth in geographically segregated areas of Western Massachusetts. Project 2050, based on “the projected demographic shift when Caucasians will become a minority in the U.S.,” links youth, professional artists, and scholars in a series of collaborations dedicated to “imagining the near future.” NWT was also the site of “New Works for a New World,” an international performance development initiative. “In the practical work” of NWT, Uno writes, “the domestic and global have existed simultaneously.” This strand of NWT’s work led to Uno’s book, *The Color of Theater*. She is now a program officer at the Ford Foundation.

*Arts and Civic Dialogue:* Seeking to explore “who has voice and authority in critical writing about civically engaged art,” the Animating Democracy Initiative funded the participation of writers in three “arts and civic dialogue” projects, assigning three writers per project. The writers were familiar with civic engagement, community cultural development, and nonprofit arts organizations. The group included university-based scholars, such as John Kuo, Wei Tchen, and Renato Rosaldo, as well as nonacademic writers. The writers interacted with the creative teams during the development of the project and responded to the final production. The essays that resulted, with responses from the arts organizations and from community collaborators, have been published by ADI as *Critical Perspectives: Writings on Art and Civic Dialogue*, which has been used in a number of college classes.

*Urban Design, Historic Preservation, and Community Development:* Professor Dolores Hayden authored *Power of Place*, a book on the theory and practice of an organization that linked faculty and graduate students with municipal and community organizations in order to recover and make visible the history of women of color in Los Angeles. *Sento at Sixth and Main* is the product of a long-term historical preservation project of the University of Washington’s Preservation, Planning, and Design Program. It was co-authored by Gail

Dubrow, a faculty member, and Donna Graves, a writer and planner, in collaboration with designer Karen Cheng. *Sento* documents the buildings and artifacts of the early Japanese experience in the U.S. The Historic Chicago Greystone Initiative is a university-community partnership that uses architectural heritage as a community development tool. The project engages students in courses at the University of Illinois at Chicago and at other campuses. North Lawndale is the focus of a major design competition, “Defining the Urban Neighborhood in the 21st Century.” The awardee receives a one-year residency at the American Academy of Rome. Winning design work is displayed as a part of major exhibits and disseminated through the publication of *Greystone Guidebooks*.

*Teachers as Public Scholars:* Sarah Robbins, of Kennesaw State University, led the Keeping and Creating American Communities Project, based at the Kennesaw Mountain Writing Project (part of the National Writing Project Network). This multi-year project, supported by the NEH, developed a theoretical and critical framework for community-engaged research and teaching. K-12 teachers became public scholars of their own regions. The teachers then developed curricular modules that enabled their students to undertake local investigations that benefited the community. Two books—one composed of critical essays, the other of teaching models—resulted from this project.

*Visual Arts:* SPARC (Social and Public Art Resource Center), founded by Judy Baca in 1976, has produced highly participatory public art projects of historic dimensions, including the “Great Wall” of Los Angeles. It has generated new curricula at UCLA and Cal State Monterey Bay, as well as numerous publications and documentaries. In Michigan, at the forefront of a growing movement in prison arts work, the Prison Creative Arts Project (PCAP) founded at the University of Michigan in 1990 is led by Professors Buzz Alexander and Janie Paul. Through a course in the U-M Department of English, PCAP supports creative writing, theater, and visual arts workshops. Alexander’s book on PCAP is under contract with the University of Michigan Press and he is a recent recipient of the Carnegie Foundation’s Professor of the Year award. PCAP serves over thirty correctional institutions in Michigan and mounts an annual Prison Art Exhibition that is videotaped and shared with each

contributing prison artist. Paul, as Director of Community Connections for the School of Art and Design, oversees the School's new engagement requirement and curates the PCAP exhibit.

*Humanities Education:* The Free Minds Project in Austin is supported by the University of Texas Institute for the Humanities, Austin Community College, Skillpoint Alliance, and Foundation Communities, an affordable housing organization. Free Minds is part of the national network of Clemente Course programs offering a college-level humanities curriculum for low-income adults. Free Minds was led by doctoral student Sylvia Gale. As a result of this and other collaborations, Gale and UT Humanities Institute director Evan Carton co-authored "Toward the Practice of the Humanities" and launched an on-campus sabbatical program for community fellows. Gale is writing her dissertation on the history of vocational education and the humanities in the U.S. She was the first director of IA's PAGE (Publicly Active Graduate Education) program.

*Museum-Based Community History:* The Harvard Center for Community Partnerships at Bates College supports projects that are integrative of pedagogy, scholarship, and public work. One such collaboration is a partnership, now four years old, with *Museum L-A*, a local museum of work and industrial community in Lewiston-Auburn, Maine. Four Bates faculty oversaw the collection of more than one hundred oral histories of millworker elders. The partnership moved on to archival historical research and exhibition development, leading to two new exhibitions: "Portraits and Voices," a collection of photographic portraits and oral histories, and "Weaving a Millworkers' World," a traveling social history exhibit. Through undergraduate research opportunities, Bates students contributed to these exhibits; one went on to join the Museum L-A staff as a curator. Bates faculty and staff serve on the museum board and Exhibit Committee. Professor David Scobey has written on the implications of the project for faculty scholarly work in "Making Use of All Our Faculties: Public Scholarship and the Future of Campus Compact."

## **Appendix 3: Executive Summary, EDUVENTURES REPORT**

Below are new programs recommended as part of a report by Eduventures, national educational consultants who were retained by the university in spring 2014 to explore Cal State L.A.'s regional market share of programs. Eduventures identified several new program opportunities for Cal State L.A. to consider.

**Methodology:** Eduventures collected publically available, secondary market data for all programs conferred in the region in 2012. Based on this data, Eduventures generated three different measures of likely performance: Conferral performance (overall size and historical growth of a program from 2008-2012); Labor performance (Overall size and projected growth from 2013-2023); and Competitive performance against other programs in the LA Basin (percentage of competitors conferring the same degree program in 2012). A CIP code—the code that the Chancellor's Office uses to categorize a program-- was assigned a raw score for each measure, and then was aggregated across all metrics to identify high performing programs.

The following recommendations would constitute new programs that have not been widely developed in the Los Angeles area among our competitors.

### **Bachelor Program Recommendations**

- **Environmental Studies (CIP 03.0103)**

Title: Environmental Studies.

Definition: A program that focuses on environment-related issues using scientific, social scientific, or humanistic approaches or a trans-disciplinary combination. Includes instruction in the basic principles of ecology and environmental science and related subjects such as policy, politics, law, economics, social aspects, planning, pollution control, natural resources, and the interactions of human beings and nature.

**This program is offered at these CSUs:**

**East Bay (Bachelors)**

**Humboldt (Bachelors)**

**Monterey Bay (Bachelors)**

**Sacramento (Bachelors)**

**San Diego (Bachelors)**

- **Health and Healthcare Management (CIP 51.0701)**

Title: Health/Health Care Administration/Management.

**Definition:** A program that prepares individuals to develop, plan, and manage health care operations and services within health care facilities and across health care systems.

Includes instruction in planning, public relations, business management, financial management, human resources management, health care systems operation and management, health care resource allocation and policy making, health law and regulations, and applications to specific types of health care services.

**This program is offered at these CSUs:**

**East Bay (Masters)**

**Long Beach (Bachelors and Masters)**

**Los Angeles (Masters only)**

**Northridge (Bachelors and Masters)**

**San Bernardino (Masters)**

- **Informatics (CIP 11.0104)**

**Title: Informatics.**

**Definition:** A program that focuses on computer systems from a user-centered perspective and studies the structure, behavior and interactions of natural and artificial systems that store, process and communicate information. Includes instruction in library and information sciences, human computer interaction, information system analysis and design, telecommunications structure and information architecture and management.

**This program is offered at these CSUs:**

**NONE (CSU has not yet assigned a code to this program)**

- **Computer Software Engineering (CIP 14.0903)**

**Title: Computer Software Engineering.**

Definition: A program that prepares individuals to apply scientific and mathematical principles to the design, analysis, verification, validation, implementation, and maintenance of computer software systems using a variety of computer languages.

Includes instruction in discrete mathematics, probability and statistics, computer science, managerial science, and applications to complex computer systems.

**This program is offered at these CSUs:**

**Fullerton (Masters only)**



**Northridge (Masters only)**  
**San Jose (Bachelors and Masters)**  
**San Luis Obispo (Bachelors)**

### **Master Program Recommendations**

- **Non-Profit Management (CIP 52.0206)**  
**Title: Non-Profit/Public/Organizational Management.**  
Definition: A program that prepares individuals to manage the business affairs of non-profit corporations, including foundations, educational institutions, associations, and other such organizations, and public agencies and governmental operations. Includes instruction in business management, principles of public administration, principles of accounting and financial management, human resources management, taxation of non-profit organizations, and business law as applied to non-profit organizations  
**This program is offered at these CSUs:**  
**NONE (CSU has not yet assigned a code to this program)**
- **Organizational Behavior (CIP 52.1003)**  
**Title: Organizational Behavior Studies.**  
Definition: A program that focuses on the scientific study of the behavior and motivations of individuals functioning in organized groups, and its application to business and industrial settings. Includes instruction in organization theory, industrial and organizational psychology, social psychology, sociology of organizations, reinforcement and incentive theory, employee relations strategies, organizational power and influence, organization stratification and hierarchy, leadership styles, and applications of operations research and other methodologies to organizational analysis.  
**This program is offered at these CSUs:**  
**NONE (CSU has not yet assigned a code to this program)**
- **Sports and Fitness Management (CIP 31.0504)**  
**Title: Sport and Fitness Administration/Management.**  
Definition: A program that prepares individuals to apply business, coaching and physical education principles to the organization, administration and management of athletic programs and teams, fitness/rehabilitation facilities and health clubs, sport recreation services, and related services. Includes instruction in program planning and development;

business and financial management principles; sales, marketing and recruitment; event promotion, scheduling and management; facilities management; public relations; legal aspects of sports; and applicable health and safety standards.

**This program is offered at these CSUs:**

**NONE**

- **Computer Systems Networking and Telecommunications (CIP 11.0901)**

**Title: Computer Systems Networking and Telecommunications.**

Definition: A program that focuses on the design, implementation, and management of linked systems of computers, peripherals, and associated software to maximize efficiency and productivity, and that prepares individuals to function as network specialists and managers at various levels. Includes instruction in operating systems and applications; systems design and analysis; networking theory and solutions; types of

**This program is offered at these CSUs:**

**NONE**

## **Appendix 4: Threaded curriculum**

*What would a threaded curriculum look like at CAL STATE L.A.? It would be problem-based. If it were in aligned with a university Anchor Institution framework, it would focus on local issues of significance to the community.*

*Would the curriculum be an entire major or degree program? Probably not. It could be a sequence of courses that allow students to work on varying levels of a local issue. In a culminating experience students with different majors might work together on a team project. Threaded curricula could be created within a department, within a college, or within structures that allow faculty to move laterally out of their colleges and departments to participate in trans/interdisciplinary research and teaching teams.*

*Isn't this the same basic idea as GE Pathways? Yes and no. GE Pathways follow a similar problem-based approach, allowing students to follow or select from a sequence of courses through a coherent pathway. Threads, as described above, could provide additional opportunities for students within majors to understand their major coursework in real- world contexts, in collaboration with students from other majors thereby providing real world experience of trans- or multidisciplinary in action.*

*Would such a curriculum replace departmental majors? NO. Departments are hubs from which faculty and courses can be linked in research projects and curricular threads.*

## Appendix 5: FVTF Survey of Faculty, Spring 2014

Approximately 500 FVTF faculty surveys were sent on May 5, 2014, to faculty members, administrators, deans and department chairs. The total of respondents gathered from the survey was 175. This is a response rate of 35%.

<b>Faculty Demographics (N=175)</b>	
<b>Position</b>	<b>Response rate %</b>
Lecturer	2.29
Assistant Professor	13.71
Associate Professor	22.29
Professor	40.57
Dean	4.00
Department Chair	10.29
Other Admin	6.86

1. What are the **potential innovative programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels?**

The top five programs identified were:

1. Interdisciplinary Health Science BA/BS (rehab, hospital)
2. Healthcare Management BS
3. MBA and Arts Administration
4. MA Entertainment
5. Broad Science undergraduate degree

2. In what areas would you like to see **innovative programs created?** The top five programs identified by faculty were:

1. Environmental studies/health/global, Warming/sustainability (tie)
3. Agriculture| food/ plant science (tie)
5. Peace/conflict studies
6. Data Science/ Big Data

3. What **potential innovative minors, options or certificates** would you like to see created?

The top five minors, options or certificates identified were:

1. Neuroscience/cognitive science
2. Post-baccalaureate program in translation and interpretation
3. Documentary filmmaking/STEM
4. Certificate in foreign languages for business
5. Program in food science and technology

4. What kind of **academic innovations, teaching methods and changes in curriculum do you think can be beneficial to students' success?** The top five methods identified were:

1. Civic/community engagement
2. Flipped classrooms
3. Research projects
4. Online/hybrid/distance learning
5. 9+3+3

5. What **new potential cross-disciplinary programs** can you suggest?

The top three cross-disciplinary programs identified were:

1. Health Care Management | Social Work | Public Health | Psychology | Child & Family studies (tie)
6. Global Studies (Environmental)
7. Women's Studies (interdisciplinary)

6. What **resources will be needed to sustain innovative programs?**

The top four resources identified were:

1. More qualified tenure-track faculty
2. Faculty time/course release
3. Technology infrastructure (Wi-Fi/cloud)
4. 3-3 workload for faculty.

**-Dr. Anne Hafner, Survey Administrator** (Cecilia Jimenez, Graduate Assistant)

## Appendix 6: FVTF Survey of Students, Summer 2014

On August 12, 2014, a student survey from the Faculty Visioning Task Force was sent to CAL STATE L.A. undergrads and graduate students soliciting their feedback regarding possible new and interdisciplinary programs, options and certificates. Students were also asked for their input on information technologies that may be beneficial in the future. The survey was closed on August 29, 2014.

The total of respondents gathered from the survey was 1490.

<b>1. Demographics (N=1,490)</b>		
<b>Students</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N =</b>
Undergraduates	80.81	1,200
Graduates	19.19	285
		<b>1,485</b>

<b>2. My Major (Top 23 Majors)</b>		
<b>Major</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N =</b>
Business	7.38%	109
Science	7.38%	109
Psychology	5.48%	81
Biology	5.08%	75
Sociology	4.57%	69
Public Health	4.33%	64
Nursing	4.33%	64
Social Work	4.06%	60
Accounting	3.99%	59
Communication	3.11%	46
Education	2.98%	44
Criminal Justice	2.71%	40
English	2.64%	39
Undeclared	2.51%	37
Child Development	2.37%	35
Mechanical Engineering	2.23%	33
Kinesiology	2.10%	31
Biochemistry	2.03%	30
Electrical Engineering	1.29%	19
Rehabilitation Services	0.88%	13
Civil Engineering	0.81%	12
Marketing Management	0.61%	9
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,113</b>
Other		365
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,490</b>

<b>3. Primary Support for my School Success has been:</b>		
<b>Support</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N=</b>
Family	62.89	937
Professors	10.94	163
Fellow students (people I study with)	9.66	144
Friends not at CSULA	5.44	81
Other	11.07	165
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,490</b>

<b>4. Cross-disciplinary courses attempt to solve a big problem using two or more fields of study. For example a historian and a chemistry professor may both study the concept of "Water in Los Angeles". A course that is cross-disciplinary could improve understanding of a complex problem. To what degree do you believe cross-disciplinary understanding would be helpful to you in your future work?</b>		
<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N=</b>
Not Helpful	2.78%	41
Little Helpful	13.75%	203
Helpful	47.83%	706
Very Helpful	35.64%	526
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,476</b>

<b>5. Are you familiar with technology relevant to your field or major? Check all that apply.</b>		
<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N=</b>
Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint	98.17	1,448
Moodle	75.80	1,118
Internet Explorer 9	64.14	946
Matlab	9.49	140
NVIVO/SPSS	6.37	94
Mathematica	5.83	86
Microsoft Visual Studio	5.63	83
Microsoft Visio Professional	5.15	76
Web authoring software (Dreamweaver)	5.08	75
ChemDraw	3.32	49
SAS	1.69	25
ArcMap	1.63	24

<b>Total</b>		<b>1,475</b>
<b>6. What type of technology tools would you like to see on campus or in classes? You can answer as many as you like.</b>		
<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N=</b>
Better Wifi access	38.20	555
Low cost software in my major	12.80	186
Laptop rentals	9.77	142
More Courses on Moodle	7.64	111
More computer classrooms	6.88	100
Whiteboards	6.88	100
iPad rentals	5.23	76
Improved technical support	4.13	60
Cloud access	3.23	47
Video Conferencing in class	3.10	45
Webcast capacity in class	2.13	31
<b>Total Respondents</b>		<b>1,475</b>

<b>7. Would you prefer allowing departments to offer courses that meet once or twice a week rather than requiring most courses to meet three times a week?</b>		
<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N=</b>
Yes	69.18	1,019
No	11.34	168
Not Sure	19.48	287
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,473</b>

<b>8. Some universities offer "build your own" majors where you can assemble an undergraduate program based on components from different fields. How interested would you be in such a program?</b>		
<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Response %</b>	<b>N=</b>
Very	39.53	583
Somewhat	42.10	621
Not Interested	18.37	271
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,475</b>

<b>9. What new graduate programs would you like to see? (New graduate programs with 5 or more responses)</b>	
<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Responses</b>
N/A, None	207



Public Health/Administration	32
Engineering	18
Medical Field	18
Forensic	17
Psychology (Nutrition, PhD, Social)	16
Occupational/Physical Therapy	16
Criminal Justice	14
Nursing	14
Law	12
Combined BA/Master's Degree	11
Bio Medical	10
TV/Film/Editing	9
Biology/Geology	9
Counseling	9
Marketing	8
Women's and Gender Studies	8
Environmental Science	6
Pharmacy	6
Veterinary Science	6
Business	6
Public Policy	6
Physician Assistant	6
Aerospace Engineering	5
Creative Writing	5
Animation/Video Games	5
Nutrition	5
Marriage & Family Therapy	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>
<b>10. What new graduate certificates would you like to see? (New graduate certificates with 5 or more responses)</b>	
<b>Answer Choices</b>	<b>Responses</b>
N/A, None	206
Medical Field	13
Foreign Language	11
Nursing	10
Nutrition	9
Mental Health	9
Marriage & Family Therapy	8
Computer Integrated Design	7
Law	6
Environmental Health & Safety	6
Engineering Software	6
Project Manager/Developer	6
Early Childhood	5
Forensic Science/Psychology	5
Healthcare/Quality	5
Bioengineering	5
Cultural Social Work	5
Criminal Justice	5
Management	5
Critical Thinking/Theory	5
School Social Worker	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>342</b>

## Question 11 (open-ended) responses

### Students were asked: Do you have any suggestions on how Cal State L.A. professors can improve their instruction?

(N=900)

Question 11 in the FVTF student survey was an open-ended question that was separately coded. Responses from approximately 900 students fell into four different themes: Relationships with Students and Instructor Availability, Technology, Class Activities and Instructionally Related (Teaching).

Some of the 900 responding students reported that most of their CAL STATE L.A. professors have been great teachers.

1. The first was **Relationships with Students and Availability**. Many students noted that faculty should work on building relationships with students. Some cited that professors should care about student needs. One student noted: “A lot of the professors need to be more one on one with students.” Another said: “CSULA professors need to care for the students. Many have lost faith or passion in teaching and focus on lecturing instead. As such, focus shifts from a student learning something to a student receiving as much information as they can. At the same time, many of these faculty do not support students in any way.” One other student noted, “Talk more to the students. Don’t just come here and teach, connect with the students.” In a related response, students noted that faculty should hold more office hours and stay more after class. One noted, “They need a one on one connection with the student.”
2. The second theme was around **Technology**. The largest response was “more and better use of Moodle”. The second highest response was that professors should use more technology including the internet and whiteboards. One student noted, “Utilize the Internet. Have free online homework. Have computer-aided interactive tools in class.” Students also reported they would like professors to provide class materials and PowerPoints online, and other students wanted more hybrid/online courses.
3. The third theme was **Class Activities**. The highest response was more hands-on activities. The second highest response was students who wanted professors to give examples from real life. One student said, “Make connections with current news events or social media that apply professor’s lecture and textbook.” Another noted, “There needs to be

more application of skills beyond the classroom. Many students learn by actively doing an activity.” Students also wanted more group activities and more group discussion.

4. The fourth theme was **instructionally related (teaching)**. The highest number of responses was “Don’t just read PowerPoints”. The second highest response was “use different teaching styles and pedagogy”, and “get professional development or PD”. One student said, “Professors should take professional development courses in teaching styles and pedagogy. Our professors are extremely qualified through academic achievement in research, but many cannot communicate effectively to the students. Our faculty should set the standard on quality effective instruction matched by their innovative research in their fields.” Some students wanted professors to provide syllabi with clear expectations and standards, and others wanted the professors to provide study guides for exams. Students wanted more feedback on their work, and they wanted professors to be better prepared for class. Other students wanted professors to partner with employers re: jobs. A few students wanted professors to differentiate instruction and a few would like professors who spoke better English. One student noted, “Instead of having one teaching style, they should differentiate between styles to ensure that they meet the needs and interests of everyone in the class.” Another student noted, “I am tired of poor teachers who are too stuck in their ways or have given up or lost hope in students. Instill an evaluation process that continually checks up on instructors. There should be accountability for how effective they are.”

- **Dr. Anne Hafner**, Survey Administrator (Cecilia Jimenez, Graduate Assistant)