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# Tasks

The existing CHABSS Strategic Plan was approved in 2013 and was intended to guide the College from 2013 to 2018. While Dean Julia Johnson initially engaged the College in a strategic planning process in AY 2018-2019, a number of factors led her later instead to ask volunteers for the strategic planning process to shift focus to a “pre-planning” exercise. Our tasks included the following:

* Examine the College’s successes and challenges in reaching the Goals and Objectives of its 2013-2018 Strategic Plan.
* Review the “Standards of Practice” established by the Council of Colleges of Arts & Sciences (CCAS) to evaluate CHABSS’ level of adherence to widely understood best practices for college-wide leadership and administration.
* Review and organize questions generated by governance committees and working groups as well as Department Chairs/Program Directors and provide a set of questions that we recommend be addressed in the College’s next round of strategic planning.

# Broad-Ranging Observations

In the course of our discussions with colleagues across the College, we identified a number of common themes:

* Much of the existing Strategic Plan represents work that CHABSS faculty and staff had been doing for years, not only within CHABSS (and before that within COAS), but as members of the broader University community. Further, while many programs and successes mentioned again and again were not themselves created or run under the authority or auspices of the College, CHABSS faculty and staff are consistent participants and campus leaders in projects that dovetail with the Plan.
* Throughout our data collection process, numerous concerns and questions were brought forward repeatedly that seemed to us more directly related to matters of structure and procedure rather than to strategic planning per se. Several are noted directly below.
* Based on our conversations with colleagues, it is unclear if CHABSS has a shared vision.

In the course of our conversations with faculty and staff colleagues, a number of broader concerns that are not specific to any single Goal of the Strategic Plan were shared with us as well. According to our colleagues’ feedback, the next Strategic Plan needs to:

* Better reflect students and explicitly demonstrate the College’s commitment to engaging students with appropriate support.
* Better reflect the work and contributions made by lecturer faculty and staff.
* Lay out the identity of the College to make the case for or analyze the current structure's future, CHABSS’ critical GE contributions, and resource allocations across large/small programs.
* Strengthen shared governance and operating practices, including budget transparency. The College’s governance structure should be re-evaluated or addressed in the Strategic Plan.
* Include clear markers/measurables; it would be desirable to identify how contributions to the College that align with the Strategic Plan can be documented in RTP files.
* Better prioritize allocations of fiscal support, particularly to develop and support diversity-related efforts (teaching, research, events, etc.). While funding realities change each year, a good strategic plan can help articulate areas of priority.

# 2013-18 Strategic Plan: Data Collection on Successes/Challenges in Reaching Goals

Task:

* Examine the College’s successes and challenges in reaching the Goals and Objectives of its 2013-2018 Strategic Plan.

Our efforts to examine successes and challenges under the existing Strategic Plan included a Qualtrics survey sent to all faculty and staff members across the College. Results from the 8 completed surveys are included in the data we present below. The bulk of our data were collected via face-to-face discussions with colleagues across the College. Members of our group met separately (typically for approximately 30-45 minutes) with the following constituencies across the College: the Department Chairs/Program Directors, the College’s staff (at a monthly all-staff meeting), the College Coordinating Committee (CCC) and several governance committees (Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee, Hiring & Academic Planning Committee) and working groups (College Diversity Working Group, Lecturer Advisory Committee, Student Academic Success Task Force). We received input directly from representatives of several Departments/Programs (typically through attending a portion of a Department meeting, although also via meeting with a designated Department representative or collective survey instrument submitted by the Chair). We particularly thank our colleagues in Arts, Media, & Design; Anthropology; Ethnic Studies; Global Studies; Liberal Studies; Literature & Writing Studies; Modern Language Studies; Philosophy; Political Science; Sociology; and Psychology for their time and attention to this exercise. Although we weren’t able to gather feedback from all Departments in CHABSS, we feel confident that the sampling of data from these departments is a fair representation of where the College stands with regard to meeting the Goals and Objectives of the Strategic Plan. In addition to hearing our colleagues’ narratives of successes and challenges under the existing Strategic Plan, we also hoped to learn how our colleagues perceived this Strategic Plan and their suggestions for a new Strategic Plan as well as the next strategic planning process.

# Summary of Responses for Goal One of CHABSS Strategic Plan 2013-2018

## Goal One: Advance a transformative learning environment for all student populations.

### Objectives:

### Identify best transformative pedagogical practices currently in use in specific courses and departments in the College and survey higher education literature.

### Support an engaging curriculum and co‐curricular activities for 21st century learners.

### Support graduate and undergraduate student research as part of a transformative learning experience.

## Concerns Identified:

* Multiple concerns about vague language, not defined, not measurable, no benchmarks
  + “support”, “transformative learning”, and “21st century learner”, “engaging curriculum” reported as being unclear or not well defined.
* Multiple concerns about lack of data both College and University-wide to be able to assess the outcomes of the current strategic plan.
* Concerns about funding resources available to meet this goal and its objectives; especially for smaller programs and departments, resources have not grown to match student population.
* Some faculty (particularly lecturers) and staff report being unaware of efforts towards this goal and how objectives are being met.

## Achievements Identified:

* **Curriculum review and changes**
  + SLO assessment
  + Program reviews and revisions
  + Flipped Classrooms
  + Texts assessed for diversity in learning
  + Online instruction, QOLT (PHIL reports taking a lead in implementing and developing online learning in their dept.)
  + Hybrid Courses being added
  + Course redesigns
  + Executive Orders- updates to programs and GE requirements
  + WMST (Women’s Studies) changed to WGSS (Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies) to promote inclusiveness and capture current changes in the field
  + New majors: AIS, AMD, GEOG, LBST (K-8 teachers), soon to include LING
  + Interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary approach (faculty teaching across disciplines), MOUs in place for several departments
  + Use of Faculty Center as a resource for professional development and pedagogical advancement
  + CAPC has played a key role in looking at SLOs and assessable language
* **Student Opportunities inside the class**
  + Labs
    - 75 Undergrad work in Psych labs for credit, ~45 undergrads volunteer in labs
  + Research
    - Psych research competitions, GBST undergrad research events
  + Capstone Courses
  + Equipment, Software programs, GIS, use of new technologies, for example digital drawing, computer modeling, and animation
  + Active learning classrooms in GBST- Town Hall events engage students with community leaders
* **Student Opportunities outside the class**
  + Conferences
    - Campus, regional, and professional conference participation (supported with funding, mentorship, staff help coordinate budget and mange paperwork)
  + Presentations
    - Fall poster showcase
    - Sociology Research Symposium
    - The Whiteness Forum
    - Community World and Literary Series (invited speakers)
  + Clubs/Organizations
    - Most of not all Departments/Programs sponsor student clubs, and many faculty members advise student clubs not directly related to their own programs.
  + Service Learning
    - Citing High Impact Practices and community engagement, numerous MLS courses integrate service learning.
    - Examples include working with: North County Health Services, Vista Community Clinic, San Pasqual Education Department, Coalition of Indigenous Oaxacan Communities, and the Center for Binational Indigenous Development.
  + Field Work/Community based learning/Community Partnerships
    - High Impact Practices and community-based research
    - Examples include: Econometrics undergrads in field research project; ANTH students working with farmworkers and migrant workers; development of The San Luis Rey Native Plant Garden and the botanical research associated with it, Archaeology in Belize, Video in the Community, MLS projects in SD County documenting language- engaging students in field research
    - Internships are offered across nearly Departments/Programs (via collaboration with Community Engagement’s Office of Internships)
  + Co-curricular activities
    - Super STEM, Discover CSUSM, Senior Experience, Graduate celebrations, Media Makers
  + Travel/Study abroad
    - Departments support with funding and staff support with tracking and paperwork
    - Collaboration with Office of Global Studies/EL
    - Guatemala Study Abroad (MLS and LBST)
    - Field work in Belize (ANTH)
  + Receptions/Awards/Recognition
    - Procuring information for and setting up display cases in SBSB lobby (staff)
    - End of year and graduate celebrations using co-curricular funding (faculty and staff set up and coordination)
    - Examples include: curated a museum art display, data visualization sustainability award, undergraduate research showcase, CSUSM Student Research Symposium AMD students competed at the state level, Student work exhibited at the Escondido Centre for the Arts, community partnerships established
  + Prep for career and/or grad school
    - Faculty advising
    - Utilizing Career Center
    - Mentoring/research guidance for example with Independent Studies

## Barriers Identified:

* Faculty professional development needs to be more robust with increased funding
  + Need training and resources regarding curricular proposals
  + Need Student Learning Outcome, Course Student Learning Outcome, and Program Student Learning Outcome development and training
  + Active Learning and interactive learning pedagogy need to be understood and implemented
* Staff--lack of buy in – defining, understanding, and recognizing staff’s role in student learning
* Changes/Lack of consistency in leadership in the College
* Difficulty creating Interdisciplinary Studies due to institutional roadblocks
* Reports and data collected were not utilized (CDWG)

## Recommendations Identified:

* to consider reevaluating the composition and charge of CAPC
* the structure and composition of CDWG should be evaluated
* reevaluate the specialized needs of the Arts (labs, class size, technology, admin support)

# Summary of Responses for Goal Two of CHABSS Strategic Plan 2013-2018

## Goal 2: Enhance teacher‐scholar practices by faculty in order to promote research and teaching as mutually supportive and crucially important to a transformational learning environment.

### Objectives:

## Improve, expand, and promote practices that support the teacher‐scholar model across the College.

## Prioritize both extramural and internal support for faculty research, as an integral part of the teacher‐ scholar model and central to faculty success in retention and promotion.

## Concerns Identified:

* Students' role in this area needs to be defined
* Confusion with regard to “teacher-scholar model.” One faculty member explains that "scholarship" in current plan only seems to relate to teaching, noting “what about importance of scholarly/creative activity for its own sake?” Another’s comments echo this sentiment: “Not sure what is meant by ‘practice.’”

## Achievements Identified:

* “All faculty do this.”
* Various programs explain that they specifically focus on increasing this model for both tenure-line and lecture faculty. Examples include global art exhibitions and conferences (AMD); faculty serve as teacher-scholar mentors to students in programs focused on graduate school admissions such as McNair and Sally Cassanova Scholars (LTWR); and faculty development plans that are designed to merge the competing interest of teaching, research and service (LBST)
* Support for faculty to travel to and participate in exhibitions and festivals has been crucial to their professional success (AMD);
* Successful contributions to various EL degree programs have facilitated support for professional development (PHIL)
* Professional development grants are critical to lecturer professional development (LAC)
* Faculty have successfully sought grants from OGSR and Community Engagement (ANTH)
* Several units allocate their available funds for faculty members’ professional development
* Undergrad research projects, field work; faculty are bringing current technologies and practices into their classrooms

## Barriers Identified:

* Funding is lacking to support this model (“i.e., college does not support our faculty as scholars beginning with severely inadequate start up packages”).
* Challenge to get information in general to be able to do meaningful diversity work (CDWG)
* resources that support faculty research have not grown (and in fact, in many departments, have decreased)
* Changes in Extended Learning revenue model will affect professional development

## Recommendations Identified:

* n/a

# Summary of Responses for Goal Three of CHABSS Strategic Plan 2013-2018

## Goal Three: Prioritize ethics, personal and social responsibility, and social justice in the classroom, in the curriculum, and in student culture.

### Objectives:

### Increase faculty discussion about ethics, personal and social responsibility, and social justice across the College.

### Increase understanding of best practices for student instruction in ethics, personal and social responsibility, and social justice.

## Concerns Identified:

* lack of clarity about “best practices” and who decides what these are
* One survey respondent noted, “social justice talk has crowded out consideration of the other two [components of this objective].”
* “Many faculty may have embraced social justice, but guidance may not be sufficient.”

## Achievements Identified:

Members of the College community provided numerous examples of successes on this front. While many of these projects/activities are run or funded outside of CHABSS, CHABSS faculty are integrally involved in making these initiatives/programs work, often in a leadership capacity.

* Multiple Departments noted that commitments to social justice and diversity are embedded in their mission statements. LTWR noted the recent curricular changes further emphasize these themes via additional course requirements for the major.
* Most if not all CHABSS programs include courses incorporating one or more of these themes explicitly. Several Departments offer entire curricula focused on one or more of these themes. PHIL may be unique in that several of its ethics courses are required for majors outside of CHABSS (BIOT, KINE, NURS, SLP).
* advising/collaboration with student clubs focused on social justice issues
* CHABSS faculty participate in (and often lead) unconscious bias and other trainings
* CHABSS faculty hold a number of leadership positions in this area, including at the Faculty Center (Dr. Ranjeeta Basu, ECON) and the Office of Inclusive Excellence (Dr. Dreama Moon, COMM), Service Learning (Dr. Veronica Anover, MLS)
* CHABSS faculty led the effort to establish CSUSM’s diversity requirement (Drs. Fredi Avalos and Kendra Rivera, COMM)
* CHABSS is the home of CSUSM’s Arts & Lectures Series. Numerous Arts & Lectures events each year promote these themes.
* Service Learning courses exist across the CHABSS curriculum.
* CHABSS faculty frequently are awarded funds from the Diversity Office for projects that further these objectives.

## Barriers Identified:

* Lecturers experience ongoing challenges in learning about activities/opportunities across the College and the campus more broadly. Even where opportunities exist, there may be inadequate communication.
* Members of the College’s Student Academic Success Task Force (SASTF) noted frustrations that CSUSM loses many students to academic disqualifications; many face challenges achieving reinstatement so that they can continue to progress toward a degree.

## Recommendations Identified:

* information literacy, value of science need attention/emphasis in the next plan
  + prioritizing ethics is important, but so are empirical investigation, facts, and knowledge
* “Having cohesion about domestic vs. global forms of diversity and the language that distinguishes between these will make the college’s priorities and contributions legible within the wider university culture.”

# Summary of Responses for Goal Four of CHABSS Strategic Plan 2013-2018

## Goal 4. Enact a broadly defined culture of diversity and global engagement in values and actions.

### Objectives:

* Cultivate a College understanding of the meanings of diversity and global culture.
* Encourage curriculum development and activities that promote diversity, global awareness, underrepresented languages, multicultural understanding, and global citizenship.
* Nourish a diverse community and help individuals and groups overcome intolerance through promotion of inclusion, understanding, and knowledge.

## Concerns Identified:

* Lack of clearly defined objectives: what is a measurable indicator? Who is responsible for the processes? Is this college or university? What resources advanced these objectives?
* Lack of consistent definition: Some group approached “diversity” as referring to race, others about Western/Non-Western or international curriculum and programs, and one department identified as an LGBTQ safe zone.
* Lack of focus on staff and students: There was more focus on faculty achievements in this area than on staff or students, reflective perhaps of the Strategic Plan itself.

## Achievements Identified:

* Two college committees were organized to address this: Global Commitment Initiative and CHABSS Diversity Working Group.
* Curricular successes included specific classes introduced across the Departments, as well as involvement in University initiatives such as PASO.
* Other Departments highlighted how they diversified their reading lists, and one indicated that Non-Western approaches to their discipline were a cornerstone of their curriculum.
* Within this time frame, CHABSS faculty were central in developing a diversity requirement university-wide, and the American Indian Studies and Ethnic Studies majors were approved.
* Recurring programs included the films sponsored by Global Commitment Initiative, the Whiteness Forum, Media Makers series, and Community and World Literary Series.
* A few Departments highlighted student success in competitive research symposia and conferences, where all of the student research in these areas had a diversity focus.

## Barriers Identified:

* “diversity fatigue,” where there is a lack of will on the part of the faculty to address anything labeled “diversity”
* Another criticism was the assumption of diversity in the University due to student demographics where the culture remains rigidly normative (and, at points, homophobic, misogynist, racist, transphobic and xenophobic).
* Through these criticisms, many observed that there was a “surface” level of concerns for diversity, without any “meaningful conversation” about structural barriers and power/privilege.
* Some people indicated that their Department only seemed to value diversity, but it was unclear how that value functioned in day-to-day operations, hiring, mentoring, and Department meetings.
* Finally, there were several structural barriers in involving community members, people external to campus, and field trips including a bureaucracy full of forms, approvals, and insurance. This bureaucracy has limited or reduced faculty interest in these options.

## Recommendations Identified:

* For this goal, future strategic plans may want to develop measurable objectives for all college climate.
* In addition, resources should be allocated at the College level to achieve these.
* There should be a clear distinction between the University campus and CHABSS in particular.

# Summary of Responses for Goal Five of CHABSS Strategic Plan 2013-2018

## Goal 5. Recruit, hire and retain high quality faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds.

### Objectives:

### Support mentoring programs and encourage collegiality among all faculty within the College.

* Provide staff ongoing training and opportunities for professional growth and promotion.
* Provide opportunities to facilitate research, creative activities, and development for faculty within the College in order to retain and support faculty throughout their careers.
* Recruit, hire and retain a sufficient number of excellent and diverse faculty.
* Recruit, hire and retain a sufficient number of excellent and diverse staff.

## Concerns Identified:

* Differing definitions of “diversity” across all units.
* Limited capacity to recruit diverse lecturers and staff.

## Achievements Identified:

* The CHABSS Diversity Working Group was convened to address this area specifically. The CHABSS Diversity Working Group has collected data on both curricular matters (GE specifically) and the kinds of “diversity” that faculty recruited within 2013-18 bring.
* The Global Commitment Initiative (GCI) has served as a retention tool, as faculty from across CHABSS convene on common interests in global issues.
* Many departments and groups identified meaningful University-wide initiatives that supported these endeavors, including the training and placement of a Diversity Advocate Officer on faculty searches, as well as the Faculty Center’s multiple initiatives – New Faculty Institute, Faculty Learning Communities and Faculty Center Connections.
* Diverse tenure-track faculty have been recruited across all Departments.
* Where some disciplines are heavily male-gendered, for instance, there have been efforts to hire and retain faculty who are women.
* Others discussed the proportion of new hires being primarily people who identified with “diverse” communities in terms of immigration, race, idigeneity, and sexuality.
* Often these faculty conducted research and other activities with their identified communities.
* Departments discussed various strategies to achieve this, including the use of key words like “social justice” in job calls, using people of color academic networks for postings, and the department-wide participation in Diversity Advocate Officer training.
* In terms of retention, tenure-track faculty had University and College opportunities for professional development and research. Nearly all departments had developed formal and informal mentoring programs for new faculty.

## Barriers Identified:

* Several departments commented that more tenure-track lines were needed than what was allocated to CHABSS by the University.
* Joint hires are complex, potentially to the point that Departments are discouraged from participating.
* Others discussed the lack of transparency at the College level for allocating hires.
* Retaining faculty also had some challenges. While recruitment of faculty of color seemed successful in many Departments, the junior faculty who have left CSUSM have tended to be people of color.
* Some commented on the need for early career awards for retention and more opportunities for mentorship outside of the department.
* Recruitment of diverse lecturers was a major challenge. The timing of hiring, as well as the local pool of available possible lecturers, both constrained the recruitment of diverse lecturers. Often, lecturers have to be recruited in a much tighter time frame, thereby limiting the Department’s efforts in this area.
  + In addition, local qualified lecturers have other schools to consider – and the pay scale at CSUSM is a consideration.
* Recruitment and retention of staff also had significant challenges.
  + Staff recruitment is often limited to free posting sites, with few to no resources for posting in more diverse networks.
  + In addition, staff retention was a major concern, with some units not able to retain staff throughout the year.
  + Workload was another issue, as some staff felt that workloads increase without compensation. Some ACs support multiple units.
  + the lack of merit-based raises was a major factor in retention.

## Recommendations Identified:

* Diversity efforts for lecturers need to be better thought out and institutionalized at the College level.
* For this goal, future Strategic Plans may want to develop measurable objectives for all staffing.
* In addition, resources should be allocated at the College level to achieve these.
* The lack of specific assigned responsibilities is perhaps best reflected in the lack of College-wide cohesion in these efforts.
* Including staff on ad-hoc committees as members.

# Summary of Responses for Goal Six of CHABSS Strategic Plan 2013-2018

## Goal 6: Foster cross‐ and inter‐disciplinary collaborations within the College, the University, and the community to highlight the central role that a liberal arts education plays in a vibrant, healthy society.

### Objectives:

### Identify cross‐ and inter‐disciplinary curricular relationships within the College and across the University.

### Develop a wide range of innovative and collaborative curricula that links CSUSM faculty across disciplines and enhances students’ cross‐ and inter‐disciplinary knowledge.

### Strengthen relationships between the College and our community partners, including community colleges.

## Concerns Identified:

* No clear guidelines or way to see what is being done. What are the rules and limitations for interdisciplinary relationships and curriculum?

## Achievements Identified:

* Ethics courses are required for NURS, KINE, BIOT, and SLP majors and forthcoming Engineering program (PHIL).
* Cross-disciplinary exchange in interdisciplinary programs such as ENVS, GBST, LBST/GEOG
* Other faculty working with CSM’s PHYS, CHEM, BIO programs (LBST)
* LBST and HIST collaborate with SOE on Department of Education grant for improving K-18 pipeline
* LTWR has partnered with PASO to develop special sections of GEW and LTWR
* Comm 461 and BIOT 460 are a cross-listed course designed and delivered by COMM lecturer
* Steering committees for several interdisciplinary programs (ex—ENVS, GBST, SSCI)
* CHABSS students have participated in COBA’s interdisciplinary Senior Experience teams
* SSCI regularly offers Transfer Success course (created via partnership with OUGS)
* Arts and Lectures events build on outside partnerships and bring community members to campus
* CHABSS faculty participate in cross-campus Faculty Center collaborations
* Joint appointments for new faculty
* Some programs are exceptionally active in this area (e.g., PHIL and ENVS)
* Digital Media courses work directly with CSM and CEHSS (AMD)
* MA programs collaborate with other humanities and arts divisions for annual Spring graduate research conference (HIST and LTWR)
* External grants tend to require cross-disciplinary collaboration (NEH)
* ADTs with Community Colleges (e.g., ETST developing ADT with Mira Costa ; ANTH and HIST working to align LD curriculum with Palomar to facilitate transfer students)
* "Super LAC" created 2015 to bring together LACs from across University (except for CoBA, which does not have LAC)
* Faculty participate in community events and have established relationships with community partners. (e.g., AMD faculty holds advisory role as a Museum Committee Member at the Escondido Center for the Arts as well as development of a relationship with Oceanside Museum of Art)
* ANTH strengthening connections to UCR to facilitate grad applications
* M.A. graduates teach at multiple community colleges and serve as a collaborative network for current MA student professionalization (LTWR, HIST)
* LBST: STEM Communities of Practice (in conjunction with CSM); GIS Advisory Board – Palomar; NCHEA; HTH intern and City of Escondido; HTH research
* Supporting lecturers from other Colleges and the private sector so that they can provide expertise and knowledge in field.
* Reaching out to underserved communities with regards to education. Arts in underserved communities
* Numerous faculty actively support DREAMers
* Through NCHEA, there are numerous collaborations with Departments at Mira Costa and Palomar Community Colleges (e.g., LTWR part of NCHEA Film Festival for Spring 2019; LTWR part of NCHEA grant to explore possibility of dual-enrollment courses w/ faculty from the School of Education, Mira Costa, Palomar, and local high schools.)
* CHABSS faculty have won Community-Engaged Scholarship Incentive grants

## Barriers Identified:

* Too many roadblocks to interdisciplinary curricular development; needs more support.
* Nascent interdisciplinary programs seek to hire their own TT and lecturer faculty, which can ultimately undermine a truly interdisciplinary experience for students
* “I am in an interdisciplinary dept and all College processes are organized to make it difficult rather than easy to continue to do our work.”
* IDS courses exist (ID 395 with TRIO students), but no clear support to expand, strengthen
* Space inhibits the ability to do team-teaching. Auditoria requests are very top down decisions. FTES becomes an issue/worry of not filling/resource implications.

## Recommendations Identified:

* Goal 6 might be a place to revisit and increase profile/definition of “liberal arts” education and bring in issues of diversity more explicitly

## Evaluation of CHABSS Procedures/Operations under CCAS “Standards of Practice”

Task:

* Review the “Standards of Practice” established by the Council of Colleges of Arts & Sciences (CCAS) to evaluate CHABSS’ level of adherence to widely understood best practices for college-wide leadership and administration.

We went through the entire rubric collectively on March 18, 2019; our collective score sheet is posted in our SharePoint folder. For the dozens of items included across seven subject areas (Budgeting & Planning, Program Quality, Dean & Dean’s Office, Development & External Resources, Faculty, Recruitment & Retention, and Students), participants are asked to rate statements as

1= “Question can be answered in the affirmative without equivocation. Policy/practice is well   
 understood and regularly adhered to.”   
2= “Partially true. May be a formal policy but is not uniformly adhered to. May be a standard   
 practice but is not codified. Parties within the College may have different answers to the   
 question.”   
3= “Policy/practice is virtually absent, sporadic, non-uniform, and not well understood.”

To make sense of our collective ratings, it is important to note that there were some items about which our group members simply had no knowledge. In other words, while policies or standard practices may exist, they may not always be transparent or adequately communicated. While communications gaps may frequently be at the Chair/Program Director level, such lapses could be remedied by including such information in regular notices to the faculty and staff via email or the CHABSS website.

In several areas, such as Program Quality Assurance (which includes curricular and program review), we rated the College as being well-supported by existing policies/procedures.

Within CCAS’s criteria regarding “Faculty,” all CSUSM Colleges are reasonably well situated in terms of having procedures and policies that guide evaluations for all faculty members, though communications with lecturers could use improvement. One weak point in this section is our perception regarding a lack of clarity and support for interdisciplinary faculty, which is also consistent with long-running discussions across the College.

Regarding “Students,” our perceptions of weaknesses and challenges with undergraduate advising should come as no surprise; CHABSS will want to pay particular attention to the issues identified under “Student Advising” as Academic Programs absorbs Undergraduate Advising services (UAS) in Summer 2019.

With respect to “Development & External Research Sources,” we perceive a lack of clarity about the Dean’s responsibilities in the realms of development and generating external research funds. Additionally, the CCAS standards identify the utility of having bylaws for external boards such as the Dean’s Council; we are unaware of any such documents within CHABSS.

Within “Personnel Recruitment & Retention processes,” it is important to note that procedures are driven largely by Faculty Affairs and/or Human Resources (which implement respective CBAs). Areas that we flagged as weak include faculty workload accommodations for personal obligations, the sufficiency of diversity/equity training, efforts to address diversity concerns in retention, spousal/partner accommodations, and substantive leadership opportunities for tenured faculty.

The areas we noted as having the weakest infrastructure were in the realm of Budgeting & Planning, several aspects of which are driven entirely externally. For example, our discussion revealed a widely perceived disconnect between the University’s physical master plan and CHABSS’ needs as well as inadequate CHABSS input on campus-wide space allocations, construction, and major capital projects.

While current practices regarding the allocation of GE resources are shared with Chairs and Program Directors, this information frequently does not make its way to rank-and-file faculty. A conversation with Associate Dean Kristin Bates revealed that GE allocations are currently formula-driven: within each GE field (D, DD, etc.), the larger the Department/Program, the smaller its GE allocation in each area. While there is currently no general call for budget proposals, the College has in the last 3 years (based on availability of funds in the second half of the FY) sent a call for one-time funding proposals to Chairs/Directors (to be reviewed by the Budget Committee). Again, some Chairs/Directors distribute the calls to their faculty; others do not. So, while processes/practices exist, information is not readily available to staff or to faculty not in leadership positions across the College.

In terms of internal planning processes, we perceived potential disconnects between the College’s budget process and its strategic plan; regarding resource and fiscal integrity, we are unclear about current College policies/practices regarding budget allocation and management of budget allocations at the Department/Program level. Budget-related training for Chairs/Program Directors has been widely perceived as inadequate, though plans are underway to expand and improve budget-related trainings for Chairs/Program Directors in FY 2019-2020.

## Questions/Concerns to Address in Future CHABSS Strategic Planning:

Task:

* Review and organize questions generated by governance committees and working groups as well as Department Chairs/Program Directors and provide a set of questions that we recommend be addressed in the College’s next round of strategic planning.

Near the beginning of AY 2018-2019, Dean Johnson requested input from the Department Chairs/Program Directors as well as all CHABSS governance committees on questions/issues to be addressed in the next round of strategic planning. The questions/concerns were collected by the Dean’s Office and provided to us. We include them with the Appendices.

It is worth noting that many (if not most) of these questions speak more to issues of structure, operations, and procedures than to strategic planning per se. While this likely indicates a need to articulate clearly for faculty and staff what a Strategic Plan “is” and “isn’t,” this also speaks to ongoing concerns about the College’s structure that are both widely and deeply held. If the next round of strategic planning provides an opportunity to engage directly with the questions “who are we” and “what pulls us together as an academic community,” strategic planning could also help steer discussions regarding the structure of the College as well as our shared governance mechanisms. Whether or not these questions provide the focus of strategic planning, these concerns need attention.

In addition to the questions shared in these documents, we offer the following questions for CHABSS’ next round of strategic planning, based on the myriad conversations we have had with our colleagues across the College:

**With regard to the planning process**,

* Should an explicit effort be made to educate the College community on what a Strategic Plan is (and isn’t) and what it can (and can’t) accomplish?
* To what extent does CHABSS have (or can it develop) a shared vision across our disparate units and constituencies; and 2) within the realities of institutional constraints, what is doable for this College in the context of the broader institutions in which we exist (i.e., CSUSM and the CSU system)?
* What can we learn from a thorough review of strategic plans from other institutions outside the CSU that have been successfully implemented? (Dean Johnson has tasked Professor Quinney from our working group to research such plans during Summer 2019.)

**With regard to the next iteration of the Strategic Plan** **itself**,

* How can a Strategic Plan be accessible and meaningful to campus constituencies so that members of the College community can see their own work and the College’s decision-making reflected in it?
* How can the Strategic Plan address resource allocation and benchmarking successes, including resource development? How can responsibilities for measuring success be clearly assigned so that not all of the burden falls on the Dean’s Office staff?
* How can CHABSS’ next Strategic Plan distinguish responsibilities and goals that are College-specific from those that are the responsibility of other units on campus?

## Appendices:

* relevant emails from CHABSS Dean’s Office
* protocol/script developed for meetings with CHABSS constituencies
* spreadsheet with all Goals/Objectives from 2013-2018 Strategic Plan
* CCAS “Standards of Practice” document
  + spreadsheet with collective responses
* input from Department Chairs/Program Directors on strategic planning process (collected by Dean’s Office)
* input from governance committees and working groups on strategic planning process (collected by Dean’s Office)