

Final Report

Program Review for the Office of Student Life at
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Site Visit: Tuesday, January 29 to
Thursday, January 31, 2013

Compiled and Produced by
Dr. Kandy Mink Salas
Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
California State University, Fullerton
And
Dr. Joy Hoffman
Director of the Cultural Center
Whittier College

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
I. Overview of Project and Report Structure	3
II. Executive Summary	5
III. Reports/Findings From Campus Interviews	7
IV. Mission	11
V. Programs/Services	11
VI. Organizational Structure	12
VII. Resources	13
VIII. Assessment/Evaluation	15
IX. Administrative Policy	16
X. Recommendations	17

I. Overview of Project and Report Structure

“Make no little plans. They have no magic to stir the blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency. Think big.

Daniel Burnham, Chicago architect. (1846-1912) (Abridged.)

The Office of Student Life at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona has embarked on a review of mission, programs and services in an effort to determine what is going well and to identify areas of needed improvement. This review is done with the intention of providing excellent service to all campus community members and in order to provide a top-quality learning experience for Cal Poly Pomona students.

The Division of Student Affairs at Cal Poly Pomona regularly conducts reviews of each department, often conducted by off-campus reviewers. In early 2013, external members of the higher education community completed a Program Review of the Office of Student Life via a thorough evaluation and examination of services, programs and practices.

The external reviewers conducted an on-site visit and interviewed staff members of Student Life and the Cultural Centers as well as campus partners including faculty, staff, students, community members and former Student Life staff. Departmental, divisional, and campus materials were reviewed, including annual reports, assessment reports, strategic plans, promotional materials, organization charts, policies and procedures, and campus program materials.

The Program Review focused on the following criteria:

- Program Review – assessing the department’s mission, programs and services and performance in areas of student involvement and engagement.
- Organizational Structure – assessing the leadership of management, organizational reporting structure, human resource areas, and both campus and external relations.
- Resources – assessing financial management, facilities, technology being used and equipment.
- Assessment & Evaluation – assessing the level of a culture of evidence.

Program Reviewers were asked to make recommendations on the following areas:

- The effectiveness of the current Student Life model
- Recommendations for enhancement of the current model
- Recommendations for managing reductions in budget and staffing
- Assessing the perceived purpose and value of Student Life
- Recommendations for long-term vision setting for Student Life

There were two external reviewers involved with the Program Review process.

Program Review Chair:

Dr. Kandy Mink Salas has been a university student affairs professional for 26 years working in the areas of student affairs administration, student retention services, student life, and leadership training and development. She currently serves as the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs at California State University, Fullerton where she has oversight responsibility for Student Academic Services, Educational Partnerships (including TRIO programs), Career Center, University Learning Center, WoMen’s Center, Veterans Services, and Athletics Academic Services. She also serves on the campus Strategic Planning Committee and the AB540 Task Force. Prior to this position, Dr. Mink Salas served as the Dean of Students and Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs at CSUF, as the Associate Director of Student Life at CSUF, and as the Assistant Director of Student Activities at the University of San Diego. She is an adjunct faculty member in the College of Education at Cal State Fullerton and in the School of Behavioral and Applied Sciences at Azusa Pacific University. Dr. Mink Salas received her B.A. in English with a specialization in Women’s Studies from UCLA, her M.S. in Counseling and Human Development from Minnesota State University, Moorhead, and her Ph.D. in Education from Claremont Graduate University. Her research focus is in leadership studies, women in leadership, retention strategies, and college development theory.

Program Review Committee Member:

Dr. Joy Hoffman has worked in student affairs for 18 years. She began her career working in the areas of new student programs, student activities, clubs and organizations, student government, and sexual violence education. For the past 11 years, she has worked in multicultural services. She has served 5 years at Azusa Pacific University as the Director of Multi Ethnic Programs and has served as the Director of the Cultural Center at Whittier College for the last 6 years. Her current role allows her to work with racially and ethnically diverse, LGBTQIA, and religious/spiritual student populations. Her experience includes student leadership training, group facilitation, scholarship advising, diversity training, and program/event planning. She also serves as the second judicial officer for Whittier College’s Student Conduct Board. Joy possesses strong leadership related to learning outcomes assessment and application of theory to practice.

At Cal Poly Pomona, Student Life and the Cultural Centers have been joined organizationally to form the Office of Student Life and Cultural Centers (OSLCC). This Program Review of the Office of Student Life was intended to focus solely on the Student Life functions of the OSLCC, partly because the Cultural Centers underwent their own Program Review in 2010. However, because the two operations have merged to become OSLCC, it was virtually impossible to separate completely the comments from the campus community into two distinct categories. Therefore, this review does comment on the organizational structure, staffing functions, mission, and resources associated with the combined operation of the OSLCC. This review does not evaluate or go into detail regarding the programs and services of the Cultural Centers.

II. Executive Summary of Findings

During the three-day Program Review visit, the external reviewers conducted 33 separate meetings with a wide variety of campus constituents. The reviewers interviewed and interacted with approximately 120 individuals, both in group and one-on-one settings.

There is great consistency in the campus community regarding perceptions of the Office of Student Life purpose and mission. Answers in this area commonly mentioned OSL's responsibility to provide services to clubs and organizations, including chartering; Greek Life advising; MyBAR; ASI advising; and facilities scheduling. Also frequently mentioned was the responsibility for student involvement on campus, leadership development, event planning advisement, student engagement, and cultural competency. One participant said that the OSL was responsible for "anything involving students outside of the classroom". For the most part, campus community expectations match what the campus community believes is the purpose and mission of the OSL.

By far, the most commonly mentioned set of programs brought up when interviewees were asked to identify what the OSL should prioritize moving into the future, were the leadership programs. OSLCC has discontinued four leadership programs over the past two years. Students and staff are very disappointed that these programs no longer exist. There is a very real loss and even sadness about the reality of the budget cuts that resulted in the end of these programs.

Another program area of concern with students is their limited ability to charter clubs. The fact that students can only charter clubs at certain times of the year, and that there is a moratorium on the chartering of new clubs, is very frustrating for some students. Students are also very concerned about what they perceive as a lack of service to existing clubs and organizations.

Another area mentioned during these conversations was the duplication of services on campus related to facilities scheduling and event advising. Students and staff alike commented that because the OSL is so busy with handling basic student life information requests, logistics management, and meeting the demands placed on the office with a much smaller staff, the event advising that arises from facilities reservations has been seriously diminished. Because of this, event advising has been unintentionally pushed to other points of contact for a student, including service providers on campus. One student leader commented that the acronym OSL now stands for the “Office of Student Logistics”.

Many people interviewed commented that the OSL functions perfectly match the campus philosophy statement, “Learn by Doing”. This alignment is impressive. The stated mission of OSL also aligns very strongly with the Cal Poly Pomona campus-wide Learning Outcomes. The merging of the OSL and Cultural Centers has been a positive change in the campus community. Students and staff can readily articulate the reasons for the change and can see how the two operations fit together. However, because of resource issues and in order to keep staffing levels where they need to be in the Cultural Centers, the Centers have become the primary hub for student programs and leadership training.

The OSL has taken some major budget cuts in the last 4-5 years as the campus has experienced financial challenges. The office has gone from a high of 10 professional and support staff devoted exclusively to student life functions, to 4.5 staff today. This has resulted in the OSL having to work in a “triage” fashion, to focus on functions that are absolutely necessary for operations to continue, risk management, and to meet policy demands. The OSLCC staffing plan would benefit from a reorganized or reconsidered plan based on staff strengths, expertise, education, experience of team members, the mission of the OSL and Cultural Centers, and the perception they wish to communicate to students and the community.

Campus-wide documents, Division of Student Affairs documents, and the OSLCC mission and vision statement guide appropriate learning outcomes for the OSLCC. All legal, ethical and policy standards appear to be in line with Chancellor’s Office, University, Division, and industry standards. There are 45 recommendations for action for the OSLCC in the last section of this report.

Overall, the staff of the Office of Student Life is perceived as very hard working and highly skilled. The OSL is seen as the hub for club and organization work, Greek Life, facilities reservations, and MyBAR. The Cal Poly Pomona Office of Student Life has a great reputation from past accomplishments, a fine foundation, and, with an infusion of a reasonable level of new resources, some re-alignment of programs and services, and a re-commitment to a focused agenda, the Office of Student Life can continue its contributions to student success.

III. Reports/Findings from Campus Interviews

During the three-day visit, the external reviewers conducted 33 separate meetings with a wide variety of campus constituents. The reviewers interviewed and interacted with approximately 120 individuals, both in group and one-on-one settings. An interview protocol was used, based on suggestions from OSL leadership, and data was gathered on a variety of topics. The following is a synopsis of the most consistent and useful answers.

A. Campus Community Perceptions of the Office of Student Life Purpose

There is great consistency in the campus community regarding perceptions of the Office of Student Life purpose and mission. Answers in this area commonly mentioned OSL's responsibility to provide services to clubs and organizations, including chartering; Greek Life advising; MyBAR; ASI advising; and facilities scheduling. Also frequently mentioned was the responsibility for student involvement on campus, leadership development, event planning advisement, student engagement, and cultural competency. One participant said, "OSL develops people to become successful in the world, gives them leadership skills, cultural awareness, communications skills, and helps them learn how to present themselves."

A number of interviewees mentioned that Student Life is seen as a "go-to" place for information on campus, and that many on-and off-campus entities call OSL for information on just about everything. Several participants mentioned risk management for campus events, protest monitoring, social justice education and advocacy. Fewer participants mentioned the LA Fair program, Bronco Fusion, and the Rose Float. A few interviewees mentioned OSL as the keeper and encourager of school spirit and tradition, and one talked about OSL's role in making connections with the outside community. One participant said that OSL was responsible for "anything involving students outside of the classroom".

Concerns and points of confusion that emerged via this line of questioning included the following:

- It is sometimes difficult to understand what the OSL role is and what the ASI role is on campus.
- The Cultural Centers and their programs were mentioned quite often in response to questions about the OSL purpose. The positive side of this is that the campus community seems to be fully embracing the merger of the Student Life operations and the Cultural Centers. At this point, it is difficult for the campus to see OSL and the Cultural Centers as two separate entities. The negative side is reflected in the comment of one participant, who said, "the Cultural Centers are a hallmark, unique in the CSU. On the OSL side,

there isn't a hallmark, especially since the leadership programs have been cut".

B. Campus Community Expectations of the Office of Student Life

For the most part, campus community expectations match what the campus community believes is the purpose and mission of OSL. Specific expectations mentioned by several people, in addition to the specific programs and services mentioned in A. above, include the expectation that the OSL 1) helps students get involved, 2) provides weekend programming, 3) is able to answer all student questions about campus life, 4) assists off-campus entities with information, 5) helps student leaders develop their organizations, 6) provides training for club and organization leaders, 7) conducts a broad array of evaluation and assessment studies, including student learning assessment, 8) produces big campus-wide events, 9) helps to build an inclusive environment through diversity education, and 10) helps commuter students make connections.

Student Life connections to the curriculum and the OSL involvement with FYE were mentioned by a few interviewees. On a less positive note was the comment by one interviewee that, "with no money for programs and with SDLI and the Leadership Retreat gone, OSL is not a player anymore, it is on the periphery".

C. Programs and Services Desired and Prioritized by the Campus Community

By far, the most commonly mentioned set of programs brought up when interviewees were asked to identify what the OSL should prioritize, were the leadership programs. OSLCC has discontinued four leadership programs over the past two years. These include the Student Development Leadership Institute (SDLI), the 3D Leadership Conference, the Council Transition Retreat, and an annual Cross Cultural Retreat. (Although the Cross Cultural Retreat is coordinated by the Cultural Centers, students see all of the leadership programs as emanating from OSLCC.) Students and staff are very disappointed that these programs no longer exist. There is a very real loss and even sadness about the reality of the budget cuts that resulted in the end of these programs.

Another program area of concern with students is their limited ability to charter clubs. The fact that students can only charter clubs at certain times of the year, and that there is a moratorium on the chartering of new clubs, is very frustrating for some students. Students are also very concerned about what they perceive as a lack of service to existing clubs and organizations. Students describe the chartering and facilities reservation process as confusing, saying they feel they have to run back and forth between OSL and ASI. Student leaders would like OSL to prioritize club and organization advising on issues such as event planning, funding sources, and risk management. Students would also like OSL to prioritize club advisor training.

Campus staff colleagues would also like the OSL to prioritize leadership development and student organization advising issues. Colleagues believe that students are missing a unique opportunity for development because of the lost leadership programs. They also believe that the drop in the amount of club advising that the OSL is able to provide has contributed to the advising functions being “pushed” to a variety of other campus offices, resulting in “de facto” student event advising by non-OSL staff.

All interviewees who expressed frustration at the OSL prioritization of certain functions over others also expressed the knowledge that this is due to budget cuts. One staff colleague commented, “as soon as OSL makes progress, they get downsized again”. The campus community perceives that the staff cuts have resulted in the OSL having to prioritize core functions that revolve around risk management, facilities scheduling, and campus policies and procedures, and to de-prioritize functions revolving around student learning and development. As an example, one student leader commented that the acronym OSL now stands for the “Office of Student Logistics”.

D. Vision (Wish List) for the Office of Student Life

Interview participants were asked to describe their vision for the Office of Student Life, their “wish list” for a better future. Here are some of the most commonly mentioned ideas:

- More staff, specifically to focus on re-instituting leadership programs and to provide administrative assistance, especially in the front office
- More funds for programs
- More branding and marketing of the programs of the OSL
- Physically move all Cultural Centers to the stables
- One-stop shop for club and organization needs
- A focus on fundraising
- More user-friendly campus calendar of events
- More user-friendly interface on MyBAR, more student use of the tool, and potential integration into FYE or Freshmen Housing
- Website updates and renewal
- More all-campus, signature events
- All club and organization officers required to attend training
- A system to communicate efficiently with club officers
- More cultivation of student leaders and a progression or “leadership ladder” model in use
- A clarification of the advising structure for the Rose Float program
- Stronger connections between OSLCC programs and services and the curriculum
- Centralized campus scheduling, and perhaps moved out of OSL

E. What opportunities exist for efficiency and effectiveness?

Participants were asked about possible areas of increased efficiency and effectiveness in the OSL. One observation that was made several times was that duplication of services now exists with regards to leadership training. Because of the vacuum left by the discontinued leadership programs, several offices are now trying to fill this gap. However, these efforts on behalf of several campus offices are not necessarily approaching the leadership development work of the campus in a coordinated way.

Another observation made about the cancelled leadership programs was, in the past, these programs would provide structure to the student leader training experience on campus, which promoted an environment where, as one participant put it, “everyone would be on the same page.” These programs would teach similar content year to year, and training would be intentional versus hit and miss. Several interviewees felt that with the missing programs, staff in multiple areas are now having to spend more time with students one-on-one with individual training, and that the cost of staff time spent on student leader training may even be more than in the past when the training was done in a coordinated way.

Another area mentioned during these conversations was the duplication of services related to facilities scheduling and event advising. Students and staff alike commented that because the OSL is so busy with handling basic student life information requests, logistics management, and meeting the demands placed on the office with a much smaller staff, the event advising that arises from facilities reservations has been seriously diminished. Because of this, event advising has been unintentionally pushed to points of contact for a student, including service providers on campus. Because students are not sure what to ask, and many of these service providers are not trained as event and organization advisors, a lack of communication in facilities scheduling and management has emerged and results in program planning errors and frustration.

Many participants commented on the possible impending move of facilities scheduling to a central office and believe this would help with efficiency. A related comment suggested that the EMS functions across campus could communicate more effectively, and that perhaps there should be an EMS Users Group.

Finally, several participants commented on efficiencies that are not being taken advantage of because of outdated computer hardware and software, difficult to use software interfaces, outdated websites, and a limited use of social media. Students and staff also wondered about the amount of staff time used to interface with non-student, off-campus visitors; while students understand that this is an OSL mandate, they asked, “is this time spent wisely?”

IV. Mission

It is clear that the campus community has a clear vision of the Office of Student Life's mission and purpose, and that this mission matches OSL's stated mission of:

To provide students with intentional learning experiences that promotes leadership, empowerment, social justice, and community development.

Many people interviewed commented that the OSL functions perfectly match the campus philosophy statement, "Learn by Doing". This alignment is impressive. The stated mission of OSL also aligns very strongly with the Cal Poly Pomona campus-wide Learning Outcomes. In addition, the OSL mission connects with the Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan 2015 Initiatives, with Initiatives focused on "Building Bronco Pride", enhancing communication and improving technology.

The challenge with the current diminished resource situation is that the OSL mission matches what they are expected to do, but not what they are actually able to prioritize or fully realize. As evidenced by the interviewee comments, the OSL currently needs to focus on logistics and basic office functions, rather than on the focus areas stated in the OSL mission statement.

V. Programs/Services

The Office of Student Life is involved in a variety of programs and services contributing to the co-curriculum and campus life. Given budget cuts over the past 4 – 5 years, the office is now focused on clubs and organizations, including chartering; Greek Life advising; MyBAR; ASI advising; and facilities scheduling. Other programs that the OSL advises, collaborates on, or produces include the LA Fair program, club councils, Bronco Fusion, and the Rose Float. These programs and services are produced and advised in a professional and competent manner. The OSL staff is perceived as having a high degree of skill in the management of the programs they are able to advise.

The primary challenge in producing programs and services emanating from the OSL is the lack of staff time. On-going student programs, outside of Greek Life and the Cultural Centers, are very few. Event and program planning are no longer a focus of the OSL, with the staff needing to spend large amounts of time on calendar and facility management. Student leaders do not receive the level of advising through OSL that they would like, although this is an expectation. The OSL is perceived as the "go to" office, but more and more, student organization advising seems to be moving to ASI. Unfortunately, some advising occurs too late, causing student leaders to rush around campus last minute for paperwork and signatures, or causes event advising

to happen in a “de facto” manner done by staff in various support offices around campus. The OSL is intended to be the office that provides club and organization advising regarding program and leadership development, student organization chartering, risk management, policies, paperwork, etc., but, because of volume, the office is focused on facilities and calendar.

VI. Organizational Structure

a. Staffing

The OSL has taken some major budget cuts in the last 4-5 years as the campus has experienced financial challenges. The office has gone from a high of 10 professional and support staff devoted exclusively to student life functions, to the 4.5 staff members it has today. This has resulted in the OSL having to work in a “triage” fashion, to focus on functions that are absolutely necessary for operations to continue, risk management, and to meet policy demands. Given what they are perceived and expected to do, there is no question that the Office of Student Life is understaffed. There is a perception among campus community members that Student Life is “the department that gets cut when there are cuts to be made.”

The necessary budget cuts have resulted in some perhaps unintended consequences. Quite a few of the positions in the OSLCC are either half time in one program area and half time in another, temporary, or both. There has been a lot of change and turnover among the staff. The staffing uncertainty and fluidity has caused anxiety and frustration among student leaders and campus colleagues. While the team is in good spirits and continues to focus on the positive, the situation most likely will eventually cause low morale and the OSL may lose good people to other institutions and jobs. In addition, the “piecemeal” nature of the current staffing pattern, with people half time in one area and half-time in another, is not the most efficient or effective way to serve students

b. Leadership

The leadership of the OSLCC has done its best with a challenging situation. The Director is seen as a person who works very well with campus partners, manages the operation with integrity and professionalism, and has worked to keep spirits high even in light of the changing resources landscape.

c. Organization and Management

The merging of the OSL and Cultural Centers has been a positive change in the campus community. Students and staff can readily articulate the reasons for the change and can see how the two operations fit together. However, because of resource issues and in order to keep staffing levels where they need to be in the

Cultural Centers, the Centers have become the primary hub for student programs and leadership training. However, this leadership training it is done through individual Cultural Center workshops, programs, and one-in-one training vs. a concerted campus-wide effort for cross training with all student leaders. This model is not the most efficient use of staff time or of service delivery.

The OSLCC staffing plan would benefit from a reorganized or minimally, reconsidered plan based on staff strengths, expertise, education, experience of team members, the mission of the OSL and Cultural Centers, and the perception they wish to communicate to students and the community. This may require a difficult conversation involving all members of the OSLCC staff related to:

1. Who are we?
2. What do we do?
3. Why do we do it?
4. How do we do it?
5. What is our focus?
6. How does all of this fit with institutional and departmental mission?
7. What are the “extras” that may or may not fit with our mission and goals?
8. How can we best utilize our team to be most effective?

d. Internal and External Relations

The relationships that the OSL staff has with others, both on and off campus, are positive. Professional and productive relationships are nurtured and the staff has a reputation for strong collaboration. There are some pockets of frustration that are perhaps related to the lowered staffing levels. Campus services providers believe that students could be better prepared when they attempt to access campus services. Fellow student affairs colleagues are open to discussing additional partnerships to help the OSLCC by taking on various tasks and functions. It is difficult to create vision and make new plans when focused on the day-to-day process of keeping the operation running.

VII. Resources

a. Implications of Budget Cuts

As evidenced by the many comments gathered during the interview process, budget cuts have definitely affected staffing, services, and the ability for the OSL to meet its mission and goals. The budget cuts seem to have also prompted the further integration of the OSL operation and the Cultural Centers program (shared staffing, for example) and this has resulted in a loss of programs and services on the Student Life “side”. However, the integrated “Office of Student Life and Cultural Centers” model seems to be working and, once adequately staffed with permanent employees, will add a unique richness to the student life at Cal Poly Pomona.

Educated, experienced, and full-time staff is necessary to:

- Advise student programs and leaders
- Train student leaders and supervise Graduate Assistants
- Provide consistency
- Communicate to students and the campus community that the OSL is a valued part of the student life experience
- Communicate to the OSL that they matter
- Provide programs and leadership in areas that the OSL was once known for, but now cannot do effectively (leadership programs, event advising, club and organization advising, etc.)

b. Fiscal

Again, financial resources are not where they need to be for the OSL operation. All concerned recognizes this fact. The financial resources that are available seem to be used as judiciously as possible, and the OSL operation is getting the most out of its budget. In trying to prioritize services given limited budgets, the OSL may want to run an analysis of cost per student for programs. This should not be the only measure to use but should be used as a data portfolio in making decisions about what to prioritize.

c. Facilities

A number of campus community members would like the OSLCC to consider the possibilities and pros/cons of moving the Cultural Centers to the stables. This type of analysis would also have to include what program areas would be relocated, where they would be moved, and the pros and cons of the costs of the necessary renovation.

d. Technology

There is a lot of excitement about the possibilities that technology brings to the OSL operations. Various tools were mentioned and campus community members are anxious to get various technology tools up and going. The EMS reservations system was mentioned often; students and staff want to move ahead with implementation and are very interested in the centralization functionality possibilities. There is concern about coordination across departments, which has had challenges resulting in double booking problems. MyBAR is another program that everyone on campus can see is a good idea; there is a need for better interface and functionality, and the usage of this tool will need to increase for MyBAR to have a campus-wide impact. Students are asking for the OSL to improve websites (they are perceived as out-of-date), the use of social media tools, and the campus on-line calendar.

VIII. Assessment and Evaluation

a. Student Learning Outcomes

Campus-wide documents, Division of Student Affairs documents, and the OSLCC mission and vision statement guide appropriate learning outcomes for the OSLCC. In program evaluations provided for this review (for the 3D Leadership Conference, Greek Life and Rose Float), learning outcomes are clearly stated and are appropriately assessed. Most campus community members interviewed did not address student learning outcomes directly in their feedback; however, interview participants clearly articulated an understanding of the learning intended by the OSLCC and learning outcome domains such as leadership, multiculturalism, community engagement, and organizational skills. A challenge exists in providing enough staff time for the OSLCC to appropriately and thoroughly assess student learning outcomes, as directed by campus and divisional documents, so that the learning that students are clearly experiencing can be documented appropriately.

b. Legal Compliance and Ethical Standards

All legal and ethical standards appear to be in line with University, Division, and industry standards. There were no comments that came up during the review from campus community members that expressed any concern about legal or ethical standards. Common legal issues that an Office of Student Life would be concerned with, such as free speech, right to assemble, and right to organize seem to be well covered by existing campus policy and the way these policies are implemented by the OSLCC.

c. Compliance with CAS Standards

The 12 parts of the CAS General Standards have been reviewed as a part of this formal Program Review. Standards were reviewed for Campus Activities Programs and Student Leadership Programs, since the OSLCC has both function areas as a part of the office mission.

As noted in this report, the areas of Mission; Organization and Leadership; Ethics; Law, Policy and Governance; Diversity, Equity, and Access; and Institutional and External Relations are well in compliance with the CAS standards in both function areas. The areas of Human Resources; Financial Resources; Technology, Facilities and Equipment; and Assessment and Evaluation are out of compliance, at some level, with the CAS General Standards in both the Campus Activities and Student Leadership Program areas. With regard to the Program standard, the OSLCC is meeting most of the Campus Activities Programs standards, perhaps with the exception of areas focused on the training and development of student organization leaders and advisors. The Program standards for Student Leadership Programs are

primarily not being met by the OSLCC, as the office has had to cut most leadership education programming.

d. Culture of Evidence

While the OSLCC has produced a number of Assessment Reports and student satisfaction assessment projects on various program areas, a broader “culture of evidence” approach may be needed to tell the OSLCC story more effectively. For example, the OSLCC could make the collection and promotion of utilization statistics a regular part of business. The OSLCC does such a high volume of work with student organization recognition, facility reservations, front office contact for general campus information, student event attendance, etc., that it would serve the OSLCC well to consistently collect this data and report it frequently to the campus community.

IX. Administrative Policy

a. Chancellor’s Office Executive Orders

The primary Chancellor’s Office Executive Order governing student life and student organizations is 1068. The OSLCC is in compliance with 1068 and is fulfilling the responsibilities set forth in the document. One area that may need review to ensure thorough compliance is the student leader and advisor training requirements outlined in 1068.

b. Presidential Orders and University/Campus Policies

The OSLCC staff is informed about the appropriate Presidential Orders and Campus Policies and appears to be implementing these policies in compliance with appropriate norms. The typical campus policies that an Office of Student Life would have responsibility for implementing such as free speech practices, right to assembly, right to organize, and time, place and manner policies all seem to be up to date and implemented with consistency and professionalism. The campus community is very clear about the role of the OSLCC in enforcing policies such as the Freedom of Expression Procedure; Use of University Buildings, Facilities or Grounds; Amplified Sound Procedure; Posting and Chalking Procedure; and Protest and Demonstration Monitoring Procedure. Campus community members communicated their understanding that the OSLCC is responsible for the implementation of these policies and the staff are well aware of their responsibilities in this area.

X. Recommendations

A. Highlight and Reward the Following Very Strong Positives

- 1) The OSL staff is perceived as high quality, helpful, and student centered. Interviewees said that the OSL staff is “always there for us, there for each other, and for the general student body”.
- 2) The Office of Student Life and Cultural Centers makes a major contribution to the Cal Poly Pomona commitment to creating multicultural competence and deep learning about culture and ethnicity. This is seen as a highlight/hallmark. There is a perceived focus on and commitment to diversity that very clearly comes across and all campus community members involved with the OSL are dedicated to these goals. Students appreciate this and love the model.
- 3) The volume of work that the OSL does is perceived as very high. For example, the over 300 student organizations currently recognized is a record for Cal Poly Pomona, and the support system necessary to maintain this level of student involvement is being provided with much less staff time.
- 4) There was a high level of congruity and campus commitment in the feedback received. This indicates that the messages that the OSL communicates are consistent and that there is a common set of campus beliefs about the purpose and potential of the OSL.
- 5) Over and over, participants commented that the OSL programs and services reinforce the campus value of “Learn by Doing”.
- 6) There was very positive feedback about the Director of the OSL.
- 7) The staff is seen as “small but mighty”, undervalued and underappreciated. Others see good teamwork exhibited.
- 8) The OSL uses undergraduate student assistants, Graduate Assistants, and interns very well, leveraging these relatively low cost staffing alternatives to a great degree.

B. Mission and Core Functions

- 1) Move forward to create a new model for student life on campus; don’t wait for the “old” way to come back. This will not happen. A comment overheard from a staff member: “When they bring us back to 17 staff members, then we can add on new programs.”
- 2) Create a three to five year OSLCC strategic plan that can be created in 6 months or less or update the existing plan in a more focused, specific and bold way. Make sure to compare any departmental planning to the Divisional Strategic Plan and to incorporate the Cultural Centers Program Review recommendations.

- 3) The Office of Student Life would be well served to re-focus on its mission statement; where possible, the OSL needs to invest less on day-to-day managing of program logistics and more on increasing student involvement, building campus community, and enhancing student learning.
- 4) Another core mission function that has diminished in the day-to-day program and service delivery is leadership development. For this core function to return in a robust way, a professional staff member will need to be added to the team.
- 5) One way to re-focus on mission would be to move the facilities reservations process to another office, either a centralized campus reservations operation or to ASI.
- 6) If the facility reservation process is relocated, the student staff can be trained on the club re-chartering and chartering process and low-level event advising. With this approach, the student staff can focus on more developmental work with student leaders and provide real peer advising, rather than just information giving. This service would be greatly enhanced by the presence of a full time administrative assistant in the front office.
- 7) If the facility reservation process is relocated, OSL staff can focus on mid- and high-level student event advising, club and organization training and development, and leadership development.
- 8) Re-evaluate goals around student clubs and organizations. Right now, this avenue of student involvement and learning is limited because of 1) access has literally been limited re: chartering and 2) the only functions the OSL can provide are the day to day logistics of facilities reservations, risk management, and basic event planning. Little can be done with organizational consulting, leadership and management training, and conflict resolution.
- 9) Continue to support Greek Life with a full time staff member focused on student learning, student involvement, campus community, and risk management. Utilize Greek Life programming in a more robust way to bring all campus community members together. Ask the Greek Life community to do programs for the entire campus, not just for Greek Life participants. This may result in more students getting involved in Greek Life and would help the campus understand better the value of Greek Life.
- 10) A thorough examination needs to be done of the overlap in functions, programs, and services housed in the OSLCC, Dean of Students Office and the ASI. Questions to be examined include: 1) What do we each do uniquely? 2) What do we want to do? 3) What resources do we each bring to the table? 4) How do we want to accomplish goals, without being held back by existing structures? What would we do if there were no organizational boundaries?

C. Re-engineering/Re-organizing Functions

- 1) Re-institute SDLI, 3D Leadership Retreat, Transitions Leadership Retreat, and Cross Cultural Retreat or their equivalents. Find ways to do this either by filling an SSPIII vacancy, hired to focus specifically on leadership programs, by moving current functions to new departments on campus, by dividing the leadership work across all OSLCC staff members, and/or by creating campus-wide committees to share the work involved in producing the programs. In fact, all of these efforts may be necessary to bring back the robust leadership programming that students are asking for.
- 2) Shift scheduling to ASI or to a central facilities reservations function. Design a system where a student program at X level of complexity must have an OSLCC advisor or program council advisor sign off.
- 3) Move outdoor space scheduling to ASI. Should this occur, staff and student leaders will need to work out priority of usage issues and perhaps create an MOU.
- 4) Design a system where student leaders must receive training related to facility reservations and campus program planning before they can be eligible to make a facility reservation. The current system seems to allow any member of a student organization to make a reservation. Only student leaders who have been designated by their student organization and who have gone through proper training should be allowed to make a reservation. Involve campus facilities, parking, risk management and the contracts office in the training program.
- 5) If consolidation of campus facility reservations will take time, create an EMS Task Force/Users Group in the short term to facilitate communication and to problem solve.
- 6) MyBAR development is important, not only because of the richness it adds to the student experience but the importance to the campus graduation initiatives. Explore the possibility of co-producing MyBAR with the Career Center and using the Career Center computer lab for MyBAR entries. More fully integrate MyBAR into FYE and/or into the mandatory first year student housing program. At a minimum, invest in and create a fully operational MyBAR lab/office area.
- 7) Clarify the roles of the AVP/Dean, the Director of OSLCC, OSLCC staff, and the ASI professional staff in advising the ASI and its various boards and committees. Determine whether staff time can be used more efficiently and still give the students in ASI the appropriate amount of advising. A good starting point would be to survey other CSU models of ASI advising to compare the amount of state funded staffing time that is devoted to ASI advising, and board/committee meeting attendance.
- 8) Clarify the role of the OSLCC in Bronco Fusion as a part of a campus-wide committee.
- 9) Shift Day at the Fair logistics to Development or Public Affairs department.

10) Weekend programming can only be accomplished if it is done in the context of existing structures and program goals. Work to encourage ASI, Greek Life, Cultural Center, academic department, and student organization weekend programming by offering mini-grant funding for programming costs.

D. Integration of OSL and CC

- 1) Determine ways to continue to bring together the OSL and the CC into one unified organization with a common purpose. It is time to truly merge the CC and OSL into one organization with a common mission statement and a set of common goals. These goals will necessarily have to integrate learning goals, student retention goals, student involvement, leadership development, enrollment management, and programmatic goals. This is how a broader, more impactful vision for OSLCC will be created.
- 2) It is time to collapse the Program Reviews together for one department.

E. Staffing Issues

- 1) Additional funds for new staff are needed and should probably be prioritized in a front desk administrative assistant and an additional SSP professional staff member. It is possible that there is a greater cost to the University by not having a full time SSP III professional staff person in OSL working with leadership programs, since other staff members are being pulled away from other job duties to assist with this function.
- 2) Re-institute a full-time OSL Senior Coordinator position that is not a combined position with the African American Student Center.
- 3) Resolve interim and part time position issues.
- 4) There is a high need to prioritize what the OSLCC staff will focus on. Comment heard: "I am pulled into so many directions, I can't do the job I was hired to do".
- 5) Provide staff development to continue to teach the staff how to discern how much energy to put into various areas and how to prioritize.
- 6) Regarding utilization of undergraduate and graduate interns, student assistants, and graduate assistants, create common training programs, share roles and expectations, help them understand how they are contributing to student engagement, learning, and community building. This includes Student Life and the Cultural Centers. Make training comprehensive and have the current students help to create the content; they know what they are asked on a day-to-day basis and what they lack in terms of knowledge.
- 7) Blend staff duties in new and creative ways. For example, each Cultural Center Coordinator could also have an office program focus such as leadership, transitions, cultural competence, first year experience, student organization developmental advising, or student staff training.

- 8) The Director should continue to focus on team building within the department.
- 9) Re-configure the role of “Council Advisors”. They need to be seen in more of an advising capacity and utilized as such.

F. Rose Float

- 1) While the Rose Float program is very important to the University, given the number of students it serves, resources should not continue to be taken from the general OSL budget area to build the Rose Float staff. Either have the entire Rose Float operation report to Development or continue to have the staff member have dual reporting, separate from OSL work. The current arrangement is awkward and doesn't seem to be working.
- 2) Find ways to create less time-consuming, lower levels of student involvement in the Rose Float program, almost a menu of options of involvement, so that lower-income students can be involved. If more students were involved from various communities on campus, this would justify the staff time investment in the program.
- 3) The Rose Float program needs a study group to focus on staffing needs, funding issues, mission and purpose, the student experience, space needs, risk management, and external relations, including Tournament of Roses and Cal Poly SLO relationships. Tensions exist around the role of the advisor, time on fundraising vs. advising. Students do not feel they have enough advisor time and do not feel supported by the university. The staff member feels pulled in too many directions. The staff member is not involved at all in OSL functions or the staff team. It may be a disservice to the OSL to list him as a staff member as he does not contribute to the general work of the OSL. In fact, it may make sense to have the Rose Float staff member, who is an MPP, report to someone other than the Director of the OSLCC.

G. Assessment

- 1) The OSLCC has focused on learning outcomes assessment and student satisfaction surveys. This information is important but a more full assessment portfolio should be outlined for the department. An assessment portfolio would include student Learning Outcomes data, "Stories of Successful Learning", utilization data, student satisfaction, cost per student, number of calls and visits, card swipes, needs analysis, and satisfaction surveys. This data should be collected from students, faculty and staff when possible.
- 2) The assessment portfolio should include more utilization statistics. Many people on campus do not understand the volume of work that the OSL

processes. Number of phone calls, walk in traffic, facility reservations, student organization transactions, etc. is important data for the campus to have.

- 3) Run analysis of cost per student for programs. This should not be the only measure to use but should be used as a part of a data portfolio in making decisions about what to prioritize.

Overall, the staff of the Office of Student Life is perceived as very hard working and highly skilled. The OSL is seen as the hub for club and organization work, Greek Life, facilities reservations, and MyBAR. Students miss the emphasis on leadership training and development, student organization development, and detailed event planning advisement. The Rose Float program advisement arrangement is unclear. The Cal Poly Pomona Office of Student Life has a great reputation from past accomplishments, a fine foundation, and, with an infusion of a reasonable level of new resources, some re-alignment of programs and services, and a re-commitment to a focused agenda, the Office of Student Life can continue its contributions to student success.