Program Review
Center for Community Involvement

Introduction/Process

On March 31, 2011, Dr. Elizabeth Griego, Vice-President for Student Life, convened a committee to review Pacific’s Center for Community Involvement (CCI). The committee consisted of the following persons:

*Ray Sylvester*, Professor and Associate Dean, Eberhardt School of Business, Chair.  
*Deanna Berg*, Executive Director, Hands On Sacramento.  
*Jerry Hildebrand*, Director, Global Center for Social Entrepreneurship.  
*Christie Kelley*, Coordinator, Academic Tutoring Programs, S.U.S.D.  
*Halima Lucas*, Undergraduate Student.  
*Becky Nielsen*, Resident Director/Graduate Student, Housing and Greek Life.  
*Camilla Saviz*, Associate Professor, School of Engineering and Computer Science.  
*Craig Seal*, Director, Center for Social and Emotional Competence.

The charge to the Committee was to identify and summarize issues relevant to the current status and future direction of CCI. Additionally, the committee was asked to offer recommendations and observations incidental to its review. The committee was provided the CCI Self Study and standards from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education as an initial basis for the review. While the Standards used are the criterion dimensions of accountability for university service learning programs and are thus not a perfect fit for CCI, they did serve as a roadmap for the committee and were used as the basis for the organization of this report. The committee analyzed each standard/area by dividing responsibility among its members, who generally worked in teams. Data sources and team activities are reported in each of the 14 sections. Committee recommendations are also noted in each section, although overlap of various sections is apparent and logical.

At the outset, the committee would like to make some relatively broad statements which emanate from its work. First, we recognize that some of our recommendations carry a significant price tag and it is unrealistic to think that all can be implemented. Thus, it will be necessary for CCI leadership to carefully set priorities. As a forerunner to this prioritizing, we suggest CCI leadership take the opportunity to think and reflect about their identity, mission, and future direction. The CCI leaders have done a remarkable amount of work with very limited resources, and the committee recommends using this review as a basis for planning the future.

The committee also calls attention to the final set of recommendations at the end of this report. These recommendations are a direct result of our deliberations but are directed more to higher level decision makers at the University rather than the CCI. While some may consider these to be “outside the scope” of the committee’s charge, we feel the recommendations will impact the future of CCI.
Part 1: Mission

1. **Reviewed by:** Ray Sylvester, Deanna Berg, Jerry Hildebrand, Christie Kelley, Halima Lucas, Becky Nielsen, Camilla Saviz, and Craig Seal.

2. **Process of Review:** The section was reviewed by examining the current mission in contrast to how the committee, core staff, student leaders, and other stakeholders view the purpose and goals of CCI.

3. **Consistency of Part 1 with CAS Standards for Service Learning Programs (S-LP):** The CCI mission does focus on student engagement but could clarify needs. The mission should address the importance of intentional, structured opportunities for reflection. The mission is not regularly reviewed. The CCI does implement its mission; however, the mission should align more clearly with the mission of the University and Division of Student Life, better address student outcomes, clarify student-centered and innovative programs, and detail student leadership.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** No recommendations were offered.

5. **Additional Comments:** There appears to be a disconnect between the CCI mission (unaltered from the Anderson Y mission) and the current CCI program portfolio. The CCI mission focuses on development of student leaders, but the programs are predominately organized around providing self-sustaining tutoring services for the Stockton community. The mission addresses a student focus, but it is unclear how CCI programs are integrated to meet the needs of students, the university, and the community. CCI needs to develop a formal process (ideally annually) whereby the mission is reviewed and revised, if needed, as students, staff, university priorities, and community needs change.

Comments from CCI student leaders, tutors, and volunteers overwhelmingly supported the mission of connecting the University of the Pacific to the Stockton Community. Most also reaffirmed the student-centered learning environment and their own professional development through involvement with CCI.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The CCI core and student leadership staffs, together with identified stakeholders in Student Life, University, and Community need to review the overall mission, vision, goals and tenets of the CCI. The mission should be reviewed and reaffirmed annually, perhaps at the annual Leadership Retreat. In addition the CCI should consider its identity and name (to distinguish itself from CIP) and either align more closely or perhaps integrate with one or more community engagement functions at the university.
Part 2: Program

1. **Reviewed by:** Christie Kelley, Deanna Berg and Jerry Hildebrand.

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study was examined in relation to CAS Standards/Service Learning Program (S-LP). Groups and individuals interviewed included: Center Managers, Student Leaders, Tutor Mentors, individual Tutors, Volunteers, three full time staff members, and the Graduate Assistant.

3. **Consistency of Part 2 with CAS Standards for Service Learning Programs (S-LP):** CCI programs focused on community service and educational support for local communities include the three Partners in Education programs, namely, Individual Tutoring, Community Tutoring, Saturday Partners in Education, and the Reach Out programs that include Alternative Spring Break, Voluntary Action Groups and Sponsored Events. Each program activity is clearly defined as a work opportunity or community service. However, each program lacks an explicit description of how it contributes to or supports Pacific student learning and development. Individual Consultations, an opportunity for CCI staff and Pacific and community organizations to meet and exchange information, is a process being developed to assure program goals are met; however the intent of the Individual Consultations was not clearly defined.

Program goals and practices connect Pacific students to the community in intentional ways through opportunities that provide mutual benefit. These activities are clearly aligned with CAS standards and best practices in the field of higher education community engagement. The students and staff involved all report a deep connection to the Stockton community and can articulate the complexity of that community. Interviewees felt that they have developed a wide variety of skills including accounting, educational, social-emotional, leadership and management competencies. Use of the CCI Leadership Team-Goal Setting and Performance Reviews provides individual goals and focus for each year for student leaders. However Pacific student learning, expectations and outcomes are not clearly defined as part of CCI Programs. It appears from the Self Study report and student interviews that the primary effort for developing learning among CCI students is placed on the Leadership team. It is unclear how issues of community, social justice and service-learning theory are included in student preparation. Tutors, volunteers, and other staff would benefit greatly from the same level of training as provided to the Student Leaders.
4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:**

- *Currently there are not explicitly stated learning outcomes from the Saturday PIE program volunteers. These will be crafted and the assessment of learning assessed. Agree, this should be developed for all portions of the program.*

- *If the CCI were to obtain a staff person supporting the Reach Out program, then it would be able to more accurately report community service for the institution as a whole. Currently this program is being run entirely by undergraduate students. The Recommendation to more systematically track community involvement is linked with the recommendation in Section 4: Human Resources to potentially add a professional staff person to support the Reach Out program.*
  Consideration: refer to the Review Committee recommendation stated in Part 9: Organization and Management.

- *Upgrading the existing tracking system to a more comprehensive one that is also compatible with the Hands On Network such as 1-800Volunteer.org. Projected expense: Starting at $3,000 annually.*
  The committee notes that 1-800Volunteer will be phased out shortly. A new tracking system is needed; however time should be spent investigating other higher education institutions for the most appropriate model.

- *Develop sustainable funding for existing Alternative Spring Break programming. Projected expense $4,600 base add.*
  Agree; however additional funding will not realistically cover all recommendations made by CCI or the committee. Strategic planning needs to occur so ideas can be prioritized. It is not uncommon in higher education for Alternative Spring Breaks to be funded through student fundraising. This should be a lower priority over other recommendations.

- *Create additional Alternative Breaks opportunities at other times of year such as winter break and early summer. Projected expense $2,000 base add.*
  Disagree; there is not a documented student demand or strategic reason for additional trips and it has been clearly stated that staff are overwhelmed by the workload and have no budget to expend. If additional funding became available, there are higher priorities, including finding ways to reduce or realign staff workflow at this time rather than add to expectations.

5. **Additional Comments:** It is unclear in the program description that the Program contributes to student learning and development.
6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** As the overall mission is reviewed and refined, the goals of the program should also reflect the connection to the development of student learning and leadership among all program areas. Program descriptions could be expanded to define university student outcomes and how these will be measured through an explicit process. A format should be developed for collecting evidence that confirms contributions of the program to student learning and clearly states this process. Review all programs as part of a strategic planning process to ensure that the programs are sustainable and consistent with the mission of CCI and the university.
Part 3: Leadership

1. **Reviewed by:** Christie Kelley and Craig Seal.

2. **Process of Review:** Met with University Cabinet members, Assistant Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement, CCI Director, CCI Core Team and Student Leadership Team.

3. **Consistency of Part 3 with CAS Standards for Service Learning Programs (S-LP):** Overall, there is a lack of clarity regarding the location of CCI within the University organizational structure, and the role of student leaders in decision making. For example, is the CCI a university center or a Student Life department, and is the program to be student or staff run? The mission, goals, and functions of CCI should be articulated together with a plan that addresses how best to achieve them, e.g., through tutoring programs, opportunities for students and community members, and relationships with campus and community organizations.

The current Director is a strong advocate for CCI, promotes opportunities for student learning, addresses issues that may inhibit CCI from achieving its goals, initiates collaborative interactions, models ethical behavior, communicates effectively internally, manages financial resources, manages human resources, empowers student leaders, is knowledgeable about laws and regulations, ensures staff follow pertinent laws, and recognizes environmental conditions of safety. However, the leadership roles of students and CCI staff should be articulated so that responsibilities and duties within CCI are distributed more broadly.

In addition to clarifying the CCI leadership structure and functions, the following specific areas should be addressed, with support from the university: (a) development of a strategic plan for CCI within the Division of Student Life that considers the broader community needs and current/ongoing university initiatives (e.g., Beyond the Gates); (b) effective administrative practices that reflect needs of students, community, and programs; (c) incorporating a sustainable management structure; (d) encouraging a connection to the educational programs at the University including experiential learning; (e) integrating appropriate technology (as available) for oversight of scheduling, and billing; (f) implementing an assessment process that allows for continuous improvement.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** No recommendations were offered.
5. **Additional Comments:** The committee’s principal concern in leadership is the currently unsustainable level of involvement by the Director. There is a clear need for CCI to re-evaluate the duties and responsibilities of the Director, core staff, and student leaders to better utilize resources within the CCI and the university, and build a more sustainable governing structure. Many of these elements are already under consideration, but continued focus in this area is needed.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The mission and programs should be re-evaluated considering resources and a greater role for staff and student leadership. CCI should collaborate with other Student Life Departments, Directors, and Leadership Team to implement best management practices and leadership models across departments.
Part 4: Human Resources

1. **Reviewed by:** Jerry Hildebrand, Christie Kelley, and Deanna Berg, with comments from other Review Committee members integrated.

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study section was examined in relation to CAS Standards. Mr. Hildebrand discussed the recommendations with CCI Director, Erin Rausch.

3. **Consistency of Part 4 with CAS Standards:** The CAS Standards only apply to two current staff members since there are no academic service-learning programs, and thus no faculty associated with the program (this is a deficiency which will be addressed in later recommendations). The Self Study notes state that the two CCI staff members are trained in the Standards at annual conferences such as the Western Regional Continuums of Service (Campus Compact). It is unclear how the CCI staff members received this training since it was stated by the Executive Director that there were insufficient funds to send staff to training conferences or workshops in some years.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:**
   - Add an additional professional position as coordinator for Reach Out programs: Disagree. This is addressed in Part 2-Program, Section 4 and Part 9: Organization and Management. CCI should develop a streamlined organizational structure that builds on the current forms of Partners in Education, Center Managers, and Reach Out.
   - Change CCI Administrative Assistant to 100% CCI load: Agree.
   - Salaries of professional staff be benchmarked against comparable positions both within the institution and at peer institutions for equity and competitiveness: Agree.
   - Creation of a policy and process to record and maintain TB-test results for all CCI employees engaged in contact with youth @ $12/person screening fee: Agree.

5. **Additional comments:**
   - The process for selecting student leaders, hiring and assigning tutors, maintaining workplace requirements, and performance review seem to be well structured and professionally implemented.
   - While training and development for leadership students is strong, additional efforts to build understanding of community contexts and service-learning goals would be beneficial. There was mention of a pre-term training retreat, but no detail has been provided to illuminate the depth and breadth of the issues covered. In addition, it seems that the primary effort for training is placed on the leadership students, with less attention paid to tutors and students lower in the organization's hierarchy.
These individuals would benefit in pre-service training on issues of diversity, learning styles, behavior management, community contexts and more. (See Part 2: Program, section 3).

6. Review Committee Recommendations:
   - There was strong consensus among the Program Review Committee that there should be a thorough review of all staff position roles and responsibilities before any new person is hired (besides the Assistant Director position currently in the final interview process). Three scenarios or options may thus present themselves.

   - Careful analysis of the overall mission, strategic goals, work functions and organizational chart should be conducted before adding a new position. Through this process, it is likely that more strategic alignment of work flow could be created within all positions (both existing and newly hired) and result in the maximum benefit for the CCI.

   - Reach Out program oversight responsibility should be assigned to a core staff member, either the Graduate Assistant (if the Administrative Assistant is able to oversee center managers) or the Coordinator/Assistant Director (if a Business Manager is hired to oversee Partners in Education)

   - Consider hiring a Business Manager who would be tasked with managing and expanding the Partners in Education Program as a social enterprise, including exploring new markets, funding streams, and student development opportunities. Salary could come in part from a combination of fees paid by the tutees as well as corporate sponsorships and grant funding secured by this individual.

   - 100% CCI focused work load of the Administrative Assistant. Depending on core staff, Assistant could provide oversight of the CCI Office Center Managers, based on one Program Review member’s experience with a similar agency realignment of responsibilities and the current Administrative Assistant’s expertise and experience (see Part 9: Organization).

   - Funds must be made available for senior staff to attend annual conferences in CAS Standards. Otherwise they will fall behind in the latest professional development techniques and the program will be out of compliance with basic CAS Standards.
• The assignment of qualified interns to CCI should be considered, with the Director and the Management Team determining specific roles and responsibilities to meet the growing needs of the Center.

• CCI should develop a strategic staffing plan to meet its operational objectives and a secure funding strategy to provide adequate compensation for the most qualified professional staff. This may mean a restructuring of the current staff portfolios to allow for current program activity and future growth.
Part 5: Ethics

1. **Reviewed by:** Rebecca Nielsen and Camilla Saviz

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study section was examined in relation to CAS standards. Ms. Nielsen and Dr. Saviz interviewed the CCI Director, Erin Rausch, to address elements not apparent in the Self Study.

3. **Consistency of Part 5 with CAS Standards:** Relevant elements of the CAS standards are included in the Self Study.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** No recommendations were offered.

5. **Additional Comments:** The CCI Leadership Team Work Agreement addresses expectations for professionalism and ethics. Ethical issues, confidentiality, sexual harassment, diversity, safe zone, and sensitivity are included as part of the Leadership Retreat and in-service training for student leaders. Student leaders reported that when any issues arose, they were able to ask for guidance from the leadership team and from the CCI Director. Financial controls, including use of activity codes and daily checks of accounting records, among others, ensure strict adherence to ethical standards as they pertain to CCI finances. CCI lacks a code of ethics or clear statement of ethical practice. Such a code or statement may be developed in conjunction with the Division of Student Life. The statement of ethical practice must be published and reviewed periodically by relevant constituencies. Student leaders and workers, including tutors, must be oriented to the standards of ethical practice. Familiarity with a professional code of ethics can help enhance student leaders’ management and leadership skills. An explicit statement of confidentiality should be included as part of all work agreements. At present, such a statement is included only in the Leadership Team Work Agreement.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The review committee recommends that: 1) CCI develop or adopt and implement a statement of ethical practice, 2) that CCI incorporate this element into its training programs and work agreements, and 3) that CCI incorporate a statement of privacy and confidentiality into all work agreements.
Part 6: Legal Responsibilities

1. **Reviewed by:** Ray Sylvester

2. **Process of Review:** Following a review of the Self Study, various CCI documents were reviewed. In addition, student leaders were interviewed to see if they felt comfortable with their knowledge of legal issues.

3. **Consistency of Part 6 with CAS Standards:** The information contained in the Self Study is consistent with CAS Standards.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self Study:** The committee agrees with the recommendation to conduct a legal review of all forms, written policies, and application information.

5. **Additional comments:** Interviews conducted with a number of Center employees and volunteers indicated that emergency procedures to ensure the safety of all were in effect. Tutors and other involved with children at the Center are aware of their roles as mandated reporters of suspected child abuse.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** As noted, we agree with the Self Study regarding a thorough legal review. Also, as noted in Part 5, legal aspects of privacy should be better communicated to all employees and volunteers.
Part 7: Equity and Access

1. **Reviewed by:** Becky Nielsen and Halima Lucas.

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study section was examined in relation to CAS standards. The team met with the Director and a variety of student workers including tutors and program managers.

3. **Consistency of Part 7 with CAS Standards for Service Learning Programs (S-LP):** Relevant elements of the CAS standards are included in the Self Study; however, because of frequent turnover of student staff at the CCI, there is no documentation of the demographics of the student employees and tutors.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** The CCI recommends a renovation of the main restroom to ensure accessibility. The committee supports this recommendation. After touring the facility it was clear that with the exception of the restroom the current facility is equipped to be wheelchair accessible. The CCI also recommends that more time and resources be directed at developing external sources of funding to support CCI programs, particularly tutoring.

5. **Additional Comments:** Funding is a major issue regarding access to tutoring services offered by the CCI, and insufficient funding can create a barrier for access to CCI. Although CCI offers some of the lowest tutoring rates in the Stockton area, some families within the community may be unable to afford even the discounted rates. In the past, CCI has received donations and grants, and has conducted fundraisers such as the annual Strawberry Breakfast for the purpose of funding tutoring scholarships. However the funding for these scholarships is not guaranteed from one year to the next. Funding also becomes a barrier to access in terms of the physical building. As stated in the Facilities section, the building is in need of renovations for wheelchair accessibility to the restroom.

The current location of the CCI is strength for access because it is visible and easily accessible to the community.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The review committee recommends that: 1) CCI be given assistance to pursue stable sources of funding for tutoring scholarships, 2) that if funding is available, CCI consider giving community tutoring scholarships and increase the number of community tutoring sites, and 3) that assistance be given to the CCI to make necessary repairs.
Part 8: Diversity

1. **Reviewed by:** Becky Nielsen and Halima Lucas

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study section was examined in relation to CAS standards. Additional information was obtained from interviews from the CCI Director, Center Managers, and Student Leaders.

3. **Consistency of Part 8 with CAS Standards for Service Learning Programs (S-LP):** The information contained in the Self Study is consistent with CAS standards.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** The CCI recommends that an audit of all written materials be conducted to ensure accommodation language is included. The committee supports this request.

5. **Additional Comments:** The committee recommends that all CCI employees be trained in issues of diversity with specific focus on challenges facing the Stockton community. Student leaders and tutors reported that their involvement in CCI has given them a greater appreciation and understanding of the Stockton community. However, it seems these views develop through their experiences, but are not necessarily supported through any formal training. Issues associated with the lack of training became evident when student workers discussed some of their clients who exhibit challenging behaviors. All the CCI staff could benefit from more formal training in these areas. Students also mentioned challenges in communicating with parents when a language barrier existed. In addition to the CCI recommendation of ensuring that all written materials have language accommodations, the committee further recommends training in identifying and overcoming communication barriers. Demographic data are kept on all clients of the CCI; however, as noted earlier, because of the high and frequent turnover of the student staff at the CCI, there is no documentation of the demographics of student employees and tutors.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The review committee recommends that: 1) More formal training opportunities should be developed in the following areas: Challenges and perspectives of the Stockton community, communication barriers, addressing challenging behaviors, and annual Safe Zone and Visions training, 2) The CCI implement a process to collect demographic data for the CCI staff and student workers. This information can be gathered once workers are hired, and 3) The CCI track turnover of staff and compare with assessment results for that semester.
Part 9: Organization and Management

1. **Reviewed by:** Craig Seal

2. **Process of Review:** Examined organizational chart, discussed with Core and Student staff leaders, reviewed with Assistant Vice-President and Vice-President of Student Life.

3. **Consistency of Part 9 with CAS Standards for Service Learning Programs (S-LP):** General concerns that the current organizational structure may not be purposeful and effective. The structure appears ad hoc, developed organically to respond to specific needs and interests over time, rather than an integrated, planned structure that serves the mission and goals of the Center. Procedures, expectations, and workflow between different units are unclear or undefined. It is unclear how decisions are made, who has authority, how conflict is managed, and what system of accountability and recognition is used.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** No recommendations were offered.

5. **Additional Comments:** The organizational structure is overly complex and does not allow for sufficient distribution of work load. Although the structure makes sense to the senior staff, it is difficult for new students/staff members to acclimate and for internal/external partners to navigate. It diffuses responsibility, making accountability difficult to track and monitor, and does not provide clear tracks for student growth. In addition, there are too many direct reports to the director and a lack of external oversight on the program.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The committee recommends that 1) CCI develop a streamlined organizational structure that builds on the current focus of Partners in Education, Center Managers, and Reach Out (there are two proposed structures listed below to guide discussion). One uses current staffing levels and adds an Advisory Board. The other assumes the addition of an Assistant Director along with an Advisory Board. 2) CCI add an Advisory Board which can provide oversight and identify sources of external support, 3) Core staff should be assigned to each functional area (PIE, Office, and Reach Out), 4) the Administrator be assigned to CCI on a full-time basis (as recommended in Part 4: Human Resources), 5) A Student Director be assigned to each functional area (PIE, Office, and Reach Out) to coordinate with their Core Staff member counterpart, as well as assume responsibility for hiring, training, marketing, and development as needed, and that the, 6) Director focus on six direct reports (3 core staff members and 3 student directors).
Proposed CCI Organizational Chart – Current Staffing (with the addition of an Advisory Board).
Proposed CCI Organizational Chart – Additional Staffing
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Part 10: Campus and External Relations

1. **Reviewed by:** Ray Sylvester

2. **Process of Review:** The review process consisted of interviews with selected on-campus leaders (Bob Benedetti in the Jacoby Center; Will Price of ELOC; Diane Farrell in the Career Resource Center; Berit Gundersen, Provost Office; Dan Shipp in Student Life), discussion with faculty and students, and conversations with some community leaders who have had contact with CCI (Janet Yarbrough; Christie Kelley; Kristal Bloch)

3. **Consistency of Part 10 with CAS Standards:** The Self Study was consistent with CAS Standards.

4. **Comments on recommendations from the Self Study:** No recommendations were offered.

5. **Additional Comments:** There is a general lack of awareness of CCI and its activities on the part of students and faculty at the University. Those who know of CCI frequently associate it with the now defunct Anderson Y. There is also some confusion of CCI with the “Beyond the Gates” initiative and the Community Involvement Program.

   Campus leaders in programs such as the Jacoby Center, ELOC, CRC are fully aware of CCI and enjoy a good working relationship with it. One view commonly held by these people is that there is likely confusion in the community as to what agency does what in terms of community service. The committee will speak to this issue in one of its broader recommendations at the conclusion of this report.

   Comments from community leaders were very favorable. They are pleased with the programs offered (tutoring; Real Games) and are especially impressed by the improvement in classroom presentation skills on the part of volunteers.

   6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** CCI should undertake an internal marketing plan in order to make the campus community more aware of its presence and programs. It should also consider updating its web presence and publishing a brief annual report which reviews its activities for the past year.
Part 11: Financial Resources

1. **Reviewed by:** Jerry Hildebrand and Ray Sylvester

2. **Process of Review:** Included comparing the Self Study with CAS standards; the budget for CCI, with detailed analysis of revenues and expenses; interviews with Erin Rausch; and interviews with Elizabeth Griego and Pat Cavanaugh.

3. **Consistency of Part 11 with CAS Standards:** The financial resources standards are consistent with CAS standards.

4. **Recommendations from the Self Study:** There were no recommendations.

5. **Additional Comments:** All evidence points to prudence and responsibility in the allocation and spending of funds. There is oversight and accountability in expending resources, with all aspects of the operation subject to budgetary review.

As outlined in the self-study, there is a "patchwork quilt" of sources used to provide the financial resources needed to support the diverse activities of the CCI. Institutional support exists for salary and benefits for two eleven month exempt positions and one 10 month non-exempt position as well as a graduate student stipend. $10,000 of University funds is awarded annually to support the operating budget and $8,000 has been awarded annually by ASUOP. When staff salaries are excluded, 62% of resources come from multiple sources outside the University, sources which include fees and contracts for service, grants, gifts, donations and fundraising activities.

Of great concern to this Committee is the potential variability of resources from year to year, especially those provided by outside sources. When the DEVCON grant expires, the fundamental basis for subsidizing tutorial scholarships for low income tutees will disappear, potentially forcing major changes in the number/demographics of those who are provided tutorial sessions. Changes in receipts from the Strawberry Breakfast can have an immediate impact on community service programs undertaken. Items such as unexpected severance pay and the expense of recruiting a new Associate Director can (and have) resulted in unexpected operating deficits and the inability to allow staff to undertaken meaningful professional development.
6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** University support of CCI should be increased and made stable and predictable from year to year. The overall mission of the CCI is at risk if the relatively unstable amalgam of funding is allowed to continue.

CCI should develop a strategic funding plan. This could be done with the help of a development associate. It should also develop an overall business plan, perhaps using first year MBA students as consultants.

The CCI should attempt to feature “scalability” in its analysis of which projects to undertake. It is important that changes in funding not result in the complete fading/phasing out of any worthwhile program.

Since many of the parents of tutees have found the policy of checks/cash only somewhat onerous, it is recommended that the University investigate the possibility of providing CCI with the capability of accepting credit or debit cards. The committee is aware of legal issues in this area and assumes these will be investigated in considering this recommendation.
Part 12: Technology

1. **Reviewed by:** Camilla Saviz

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study section was examined in relation to CAS standards. Additional information was obtained from the interviews with the CCI Director, Center Managers, Student Leaders, and Mr. Benjamin Buecher, Technical Support Coordinator for the Division of Student Life.

3. **Consistency of Part 12 with CAS Standards:** Information contained in the Self Study is consistent with CAS standards.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** The committee supports CCI recommendations for funding to replace out-of-date technology and adopt point of sale software. During on-site interviews, student leaders and the Director overwhelmingly identified technology as an area in significant need of improvement. Student leaders reported that out-of-date, unstable, and unreliable software and hardware systems are a frequent source of frustration and lost productivity. Accounting software has been adapted for scheduling purposes with mixed results.

   Changes in technology and the need for a long-term technology replacement plan necessitate better coordination with the Division of Student Life. However, the proposed technology replacement plan presented in the Self Study does not appear to be sustainable in the long-term because of the need for additional technical support and software licenses for the proposed individual workstations. Considering technical support available in the Division of Student Life, upgraded thin clients can help alleviate many of the current problems in a cost-effective manner, while ensuring regular back-up of data and use of up-to-date antivirus software.

5. **Additional Comments:** Core staff and student leaders are trained in appropriate use of technology and confidentiality requirements. A network shared drive enables secure use of files by core staff and student leaders. The Technical Support Coordinator in the Division of Student Life assist with installation of hardware and software and troubleshooting problems related to technology. Due to upgrades in server technology within the Division of Student Life, the thin clients currently used at CCI are out of date and no longer supported.
Lack of institutional support or external funding makes it difficult for CCI to upgrade technology on a regular basis. Considerable time and effort are spent by the CCI staff, students and the Technical Support Coordinator on work-around solutions associated with inadequate or old technology including software used for scheduling tutors and tracking tutee accounts, slow network response, incompatibility between the thin client workstations and peripheral hardware. The Technical Support Coordinator is currently helping CCI evaluate Point of Sale web-based software that is specifically designed for scheduling tutors and tracking clients.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The review committee recommends that: 1) CCI core staff, with assistance from the Technical Support Coordinator in the Division of Student Life, identify CCI hardware and software needs that will be sustainable and supported in the long term, and 2) that the Division of Student Life assist CCI to identify availability of shared resources for CCI use, identify sources of funding to meet short-and-long-term technology needs, and develop a technology replacement schedule.
Part 13: Facilities and Equipment

1. **Reviewed by:** Camilla Saviz.

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study section was examined in relation to CAS standards. Additional information was obtained from interviews with the CCI Director, Center Managers, Student Leaders, and a tour of the CCI facility.

3. **Consistency of Part 13 with CAS Standards:** The information contained in the Self Study is consistent with CAS standards.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** The committee supports the CCI recommendation for expansion of the existing facility as a long-term objective.

5. **Additional Comments:** Core staff and student leaders identified several significant strengths of the existing facility that promote interest in CCI within the University and Stockton communities. These include the building’s presence and visibility along Pacific Avenue, proximity to public transportation, and proximity to campus that allows student workers to travel between campus and CCI to work or to lead groups participating in programs such as Saturday PIE. On-campus locations including large meeting rooms and classrooms are available for use by, CCI staff and student leaders for meetings.

   Student leaders identified elevated noise levels and lack of sufficient space to support the range of programs as common issues of concern, particularly during peak-usage hours. Daily use schedules are posted in each area to maximize use of available space.

   The Director has explored creative alternatives to resolving space issues (e.g., partnering with the Central United Methodist Church for use of one of their large rooms for tutoring), but logistical and legal issues must be resolved. As part of an overall strategic plan, CCI and the Division of Student Life should explore the possibility of moving some Pacific student-related programs onto campus to increase visibility and reduce the competition for limited space within the existing CCI facility.

   Heavy use of the facility has resulted in general wear and tear on the building and its furnishings. The facility and equipment do not adequately convey the level of professionalism demonstrated by the Center and its staff. Upgrades such as double-paned windows can help reduce energy use and reduce vehicular noise from Pacific Avenue. Insufficient parking was cited as an issue by some student leaders in response to client/parent complaints. CCI staff could implement better signage or education to encourage parents to
use on-campus parking after hours to reduce congestion on Knoles Way in front of the Center. Although the building has a wheelchair access ramp, the main restroom in the facility is not wheelchair accessible. However, remodeling and expansion of the existing restroom would pose other problems due to the age of the building and general shortage of space within the existing structure. The university should consider a remodel and expansion of the existing building as one possible long-term solution to alleviate access issues and provide additional space for programs and staff.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The review committee recommends that: 1) CCI explore opportunities to share space with other entities, either on or off campus, to enhance the visibility of its programs to Pacific students and alleviate competition for space within the existing building, 2) that university funds be directed to address necessary building maintenance and upgrades, and 3) that the university assist CCI in identifying external sources of funding for renovation and expansion of the facility.
Part 14: Assessment

1. **Reviewed by:** Becky Nielsen, and Craig Seal.

2. **Process of Review:** The Self Study section was examined in relation to CAS standards. Additional information was obtained from meeting with the current Assistant Director for CCI.

3. **Consistency of Part 14 with CAS Standards:** The information contained in the Self Study is consistent with CAS standards; however, it is unclear from the self-study exactly where the data from the assessments are kept and how they are used.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** The CCI recommended that modifications be made to the two-part assessment that is conducted each year for both Community and Individual tutors.

5. **Additional Comments:** The CCI currently has several different assessments that exist including evaluations of staff by supervisors and evaluations for all tutors. The assessments are often collected by phone by the center managers. The center managers call the parents and ask them to give feedback for the program their child is involved in. This method is labor intensive, provides limited data, is difficult to analyze, and may not be accurate. The data are collected at the end of the semester, then entered into a central location and are analyzed to pull out themes. Data are specific to the tutors; however, it is unclear how the information is used in their evaluations. Currently there are different assessment tools for the individual tutors and community tutors. The assessments for the tutors are highly qualitative, and it could also be beneficial to utilize more quantitative questions using tools such as a Likert scale to gather data that can be easily recorded and compared. There also needs to be a clear opportunity to provide feedback to tutors in a manner that allows for improvement in delivery of services. The information can also be used to inform hiring and training decisions.

It could be helpful for the community and individual tutor’s assessment to have a few programmatic questions that are the same on both assessments to create consistency. Currently, the questions on the assessments for the individual and community tutors lack programmatic questions. They are heavily focused on feedback for the tutor. Although this information is important to the CCI in creating their staff evaluations, because of the high turnover of staff each semester it is important to receive programmatic feedback as well.
It was not clear to the committee how the Reach Out programs were being assessed. After a conversation with the Assistant Director, it became clear that this is an area they are trying to improve in and are seeking guidance. For example, the Saturday Pie program is currently being assessed at the end of each session by the children who participate, but it is unclear if the feedback is used to inform program changes. In addition, there is not an easy or effective way to give assessment to the parents to get feedback on their child's overall experience and whether or not they would send their child to the program again.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The review committee recommends that: 1) CCI revise their current assessment tools to collect more quantitative data that can be compared from one semester to another. 2) The revised assessment tools include a core group of questions that are asked on all assessments (or at least those within similar functions) within the CCI so that the data can be compared, 3) that information be collected at a point and time when it can be still used (e.g. mid-semester for tutors), and 4) that the CCI develop procedures to compile and analyze data in a manner that will benefit staff hiring, development, and training.
Concluding Recommendations

During the course of this program review the committee sometimes found itself in the position where it wanted to make broader recommendations for the University as opposed to specific recommendations solely focused on CCI. While in one sense these recommendations are beyond the scope of the Committee’s charge, we feel they are useful to consider in the broader context of CCI’s effectiveness within University operations.

- Assign a Development Associate to Student Life (as is done with each of the Academic Units). This would include expertise in grant writing. This person could assist CCI in seeking external funds for its programs.

- Endow the “Beyond the Gates” program with a grant fund to which groups such as CCI might apply.

- ELOC should consider including service learning as part of the definition of experiential learning. University service learning should be supported, by, but not necessarily centered in, CCI. This would also foster academic connections with some activities in CCI.

- The University should create a mechanism in one of the campus units for coordinating all student activities related to community programs. It should be the clearinghouse through which community requests are directed and filtered, and that central role should be publicized in the Stockton community.

- The University should consider CCI as a point of assistance in developing the academic component of diversity. Also, the University should help CCI develop and fund a comprehensive academic component for CCI to put the Center in full compliance with CAS “service learning program” standards.
Ray Sylvester, Professor and Associate Dean, Eberhardt School of Business, Chair

Jerry Hildebrand, Director
Global Center for Social Entrepreneurship

Deanna Berg, Executive Director
Hands on Sacramento

Christie Kelley, Coordinator
Academic Tutoring Programs, S.U.S.D.

Craig Seal, Director Center for Social and Emotional Competence

Camilla Saviz, Associate Professor
School of Engineering and Computer Science

Halima Lucas, Undergraduate Student

Rebecca Nielsen, Resident Director/
Graduate Student, Housing and Greek Life